

ON THE
INTERPRETATION OF STATUTES.

BY THE LATE
SIR PETER BENSON MAXWELL,

CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE STRAITS SETTLEMENTS,
AND LEGAL ADMINISTRATOR IN EGYPT, 1883-4.

"Benignius leges interpretandæ sunt, quo voluntas earum conservetur."

Dig. 1, 3, 18.

THIRD EDITION.

BY
A. B. KEMPE, Esq., M.A., F.R.S.,

BARRISTER-AT-LAW OF THE INNER TEMPLE AND WESTERN CIRCUIT;
CHANCELLOR OF THE DIOCESES OF NEWCASTLE, SOUTHWELL, AND ST. ALBANS,
AND OFFICIAL OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF ESSEX.

LONDON:
SWEET & MAXWELL, LIMITED, 3, CHANCERY LANE,

Law Publishers.

MEREDITH, RAY, & LITTLER, MANCHESTER;
HODGES, FIGGIS, & CO., LTD., AND E. PONSONBY, DUBLIN;
THACKER, SPINK, & CO., CALCUTTA;
C. F. MAXWELL, MELBOURNE & SYDNEY.

1896.

**F. M. EVANS AND CO., LIMITED, PRINTERS,
CRYSTAL PALACE, S.E.**

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

IN undertaking, at the request of Lady Maxwell, to prepare a new edition of his friend Sir Benson Maxwell's well-known treatise "On the Interpretation of Statutes," the aim of the editor has, of course, been to secure its production in the form it would have assumed had the author lived to complete it. Up to his death, on January 14th, 1893, Sir Benson Maxwell had carefully annotated his copy of the last edition, and his notes appear sufficiently to indicate his intentions with regard to the future of the book. These notes comprise a number of corrections and amendments of the text, some slight modifications in its arrangement, and the addition of many new illustrations furnished by the numerous cases upon statute interpretation decided by the Courts since 1883, when the last edition was published. The desirableness of greatly curtailing the very exuberant index is also clearly suggested. There is, however, no indication of any intention to alter the form of the work, or to make additions to its chapters or sections, and in these respects the book will accordingly be found to be untouched. In a few places the author had not noted changes rendered necessary by modern decisions, or, while indicating the necessity for alterations, had not effected, or had only partially

effected them, and the editor has consequently had to assume the responsibility of making some amendments. These do not, however, appear to him to be of a character to require specification.

Sir Benson Maxwell had, as already stated, added many new illustrations to the text. Owing to his frequent absence from England and other causes, which permitted of only occasional access to the Law Reports, a large number of these illustrations were taken from newspapers. Some of these did not find their way into the Law Reports; while on the other hand important cases bearing on the subject of interpretation, but "of no public interest" and therefore not inserted in the daily journals, unavoidably escaped his attention. The editor has consequently felt it to be his duty carefully to examine the Law Reports of the last twelve years, and to secure, as far as possible, that no properly reported modern illustration or dictum of value should be omitted.

The references to the cases in the footnotes have been examined, and either verified or corrected.

For valuable assistance in the preparation of the Index the editor has to thank his friend Mr. R. G. Seton, of the Western Circuit; and for the laborious work of compiling a Table of Cases with references to the various contemporary Reports and the Revised Reports, he is indebted to Mr. E. A. Jelf and Mr. C. J. B. Hurst, both of the South-Eastern Circuit.

A. B. K.

2, PAPER BUILDINGS, TEMPLE,
January, 1896.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

As two important books on the Interpretation of Statutes are already in the hands of the legal profession, some apology may seem required for the following pages. But as more than a quarter of a century has elapsed since the last edition of the work of Sir Fortunatus Dwarriis was published, and the treatise of the American jurist, Mr. Sedgwick, is based in great measure on American decisions, which, however valuable, are not actually authoritative in this country ; it has been thought that such a work as the present would not be inopportune. Its object is to present in some order the leading principles which govern our Courts in the interpretation of statutes, with illustrations of their application selected as much as possible from recent decisions, and in sufficient number to explain and give precision to their meaning and scope ; in the hope that it may be useful not only to the legal practitioner, but to the numerous unprofessional authorities, such as justices of the peace, local boards, commissioners and others, on whom the task of construing statutes is imposed with increasing frequency.

STANHOPE GARDENS,
May, 1875.

CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| TABLE OF CASES | xiii |
| TABLE OF STATUTES | cxli |
| ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS | clv |

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY.

| | |
|--|----|
| SECT. I. Introductory | 1 |
| II. Literal construction | 2 |
| III. The context—External circumstances | 26 |
| IV. The context—Earlier and later Acts—Analogous Acts | 40 |
| V. The title—Preamble—Marginal notes—Rules and Orders | 55 |

CHAPTER II.

TREATMENT OF GENERAL WORDS.

| | |
|---|----|
| SECT. I. Words understood according to the subject-matter | 74 |
| II. Beneficial construction | 95 |

CHAPTER III.

RESTRICTION TO THE SPECIFIC OBJECT IN VIEW.

| | |
|--|-----|
| SECT. I. Consequences to be considered—Presumption against any alteration of the law beyond the specific object of the Act | 112 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER IV.

EXTENSION OF THE LETTER TO PREVENT EVASION OR ABUSE.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| SECT. I. Construction to prevent evasion | 157 |
| II. Construction to prevent abuse of powers | 171 |

CHAPTER V.

RESTRICTION OF THE LANGUAGE TO BE IN HARMONY WITH OTHER
PRESUMPTIONS.

| | |
|--|-----|
| SECT. I. Presumptions against ousting established, and creating new jurisdictions | 178 |
| II. The Crown not affected if not named | 186 |

CHAPTER VI.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

| | |
|---|-----|
| SECT. I. Presumption against intending an excess of juris- diction | 194 |
| II. Presumption against a violation of international law | 200 |
| III. How far statutes conferring rights affect foreigners | 209 |

CHAPTER VII.

CONSTRUCTION TO AVOID COLLISION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.

| | |
|--|-----|
| SECT. I. Repugnancy—Repeal by implication—Acts in, or involving, the negative | 214 |
| II. Consistent affirmative Acts | 227 |
| III. Generalia specialibus non derogant | 242 |
| IV. Implied repeal in penal Acts | 255 |

CONTENTS.

xi

CHAPTER VIII.

CONSTRUCTION MOST AGREEABLE TO JUSTICE AND REASON.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| SECT. I. Presumption against intending what is inconvenient or unreasonable | 264 |
| II. Presumption against intending injustice or absurdity | 277 |
| III. Construction against impairing obligations, or per- mitting advantage from one's own wrong . . . | 287 |
| IV. Retrospective operation—1. As regards vested rights; 2. As regards procedure | 298 |

CHAPTER IX.

EXCEPTIONAL CONSTRUCTION.

| | |
|---|-----|
| SECT. I. Modification of the language to meet the intention | 319 |
| II. Equitable construction | 354 |

CHAPTER X.

STRICT CONSTRUCTION.

| | |
|---|-----|
| SECT. I. Construction of penal laws | 367 |
| II. Statutes encroaching on rights, or imposing burdens | 399 |

CHAPTER XI.

SUBORDINATE PRINCIPLES.

| | |
|--|-----|
| SECT. I. Effect of usage | 423 |
| II. Construction imposed by statute | 432 |
| III. Construction of words in bonam partem—Effect of multiplicity of words—Of variation of language . | 442 |
| IV. Associated words understood in a common sense . | 459 |
| V. Generic words following more specific | 468 |
| VI. Meaning of some particular expressions . . . | 484 |

CHAPTER XII.

INTENTIONS ATTRIBUTED TO THE LEGISLATURE WHEN IT EXPRESSES
NONE.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| SECT. I. Implied enactments — Necessary incidents and consequences | 493 |
| II. Implied powers and obligations | 500 |
| III. Imperative or directory | 518 |
| IV. Lex non cogit ad impossibilia — Cuilibet licet renuntiare juri pro se introducto. | 541 |

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SAME SUBJECT.

| | |
|--|-----|
| SECT. I. Contracts connected with illegal acts | 554 |
| II. Public and private remedies | 567 |
| III. Repeal—Revival—Commencement | 585 |

| | |
|-----------------|-----|
| INDEX | 597 |
|-----------------|-----|

TABLE OF CASES.

A.

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Aaronson, <i>Ex parte</i> , 7 Ch. D. 713; 47 L. J. Bkcy. 60; 38 L. T. 243; 26 W. R. 470 | 172 |
| Abbott, <i>Ex parte</i> , 15 Ch. D. 447; 50 L. J. Ch. 80; 43 L. T. 417; 29 W. R. 143 | 23, 168 |
| — <i>v. Middleton</i> , 7 H. L. 114; 28 L. J. 110 | 3, 77 |
| — <i>v. Rogers</i> , 16 C. B. 277; 24 L. J. C. P. 158; 1 Jur. N. S. 804 | 556, 559 |
| Abel <i>v. Lee</i> , L. R. 6 C. P. 365; 40 L. J. C. P. 154; 23 L. T. 844; 19 W. R. 625 | 354 |
| Aberdare <i>v. Hammett</i> , L. R. 10 Q. B. 162; 44 L. J. M. C. 49; 32 L. T. 20 | 141 |
| Aberdeen R. Co. <i>v. Blaikie</i> , 1 Macq. H. L. Cas. 461; 2 Eq. R. 1281 | 562 |
| Abergavenny (Marquis) <i>v. Bp. of Llandaff</i> , 20 Q. B. D. 460; 57 L. J. Q. B. 233; 58 L. T. 812; 36 W. R. 859 | 514 |
| — <i>v. Brace</i> , L. R. 7 Ex. 145; 41 L. J. Ex. 120; 26 L. T. 514; 20 W. R. 462 | 248 |
| Aberystwith Pier Co. <i>v. Cooper</i> , 35 L. J. Q. B. 44; 13 L. T. 273; 14 W. R. 28 | 92 |
| Ablett <i>v. Basham</i> , 25 L. J. Q. B. 239; 5 E. & B. 1019; 2 Jur. N. S. 285 | 91 |
| Abley <i>v. Dale</i> , 11 C. B. 391; 2 L. M. & P. 443; 21 L. J. C. P. 104; 16 Jur. 427 | 4 |
| — <i>v. —</i> , 10 C. B. 62; 1 L. M. & P. 626; 20 L. J. C. P. 33; 14 Jur. 1069 | 515 |
| Acebal <i>v. Levy</i> , 10 Bing. 376; 4 M. & Scott 217 | 209 |
| Adam <i>v. Bristol, Inhabitants of</i> , 2 A. & E. 389 | 9, 363 |
| Adams <i>v. Graham</i> , 33 L. J. Q. B. 71; 10 Jur. N. S. 356; 9 L. T. 606; 12 W. R. 282 | 286 |
| — <i>v. G. W. R. Co.</i> , 6 H. & N. 404; 30 L. J. Ex. 124; 3 L. T. 631; 9 W. R. 254 | 92 |
| Adey <i>v. Trinity House</i> , 22 L. J. Q. B. 3; 17 Jur. 489 | 229 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Aerated Bread Co. v. Gregg</i> , L. R. 8 Q. B. 355 ; 42 L. J. M. C. 117 ; 28 L. T. 816 | 383 |
| <i>Agricola, The</i> , 2 W. Rob. 10 ; 7 Jur. 157 | 496 |
| <i>Ahier v. Ahier</i> , 10 P. D. 110 ; 54 L. J. P. 70 ; 52 L. T. 744 ; 33 W. R. 770 | 544 |
| <i>Ailesbury v. Pattison</i> , 1 Doug. 28 | 483 |
| <i>Alabama Arbitration, The</i> , London Gazette, 1872, Sep. 20, p. 4135 | 33 |
| <i>Albon v. Pyke</i> , 4 M. & G. 421 ; 2 Scott N. R. 241 ; 11 L. J. C. P. 266 | 182 |
| <i>Alderson v. Maddison</i> , 8 App. Cas. 467 ; 52 L. J. Q. B. 737 ; 49 L. T. 303 ; 31 W. R. 802 ; 47 J. P. 821 | 360, 361 |
| <i>Alexander, Re</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 216 ; 61 L. J. Q. B. 677 ; 66 L. T. 133 ; 40 W. R. 202 ; 9 M. B. R. 13 | 76 |
| — <i>v. Newman</i> , 2 C. B. 141 ; 1 Lut. Reg. Ca. 404 ; 15 L. J. C. P. 134 ; 10 Jur. 313 | 57 |
| — <i>Larsen, The</i> , 1 W. Rob. 288 | 315 |
| — <i>v. Vaughan</i> , 1 Cowp. 402 | 204 |
| <i>Alina, The</i> , 5 Ex. D. 227 ; 49 L. J. P. 40 ; 42 L. T. 517 ; 29 W. R. 94 | 4, 25, 186 |
| <i>Allcroft v. London (Bp.)</i> , [1891] A. C. 666 ; 65 L. T. 92 ; 55 J. P. 773 | 340 |
| <i>Allen v. Flicker</i> , 10 A. & E. 640 ; 4 P. & D. 735 ; 3 Jur. 1029 | 217, 435 |
| — <i>v. Garbutt</i> , 6 Q. B. D. 165 ; 50 L. J. Q. B. 141 ; 29 W. R. 287 ; 4 Asp. M. C. 520 n. | 186 |
| — <i>v. Thompson</i> , L. R. 5 Q. B. 336 ; 39 L. J. M. C. 102 ; 22 L. T. 472 ; 18 W. R. 1196 | 389 |
| <i>Alliance Bank v. Carey</i> , 5 C. P. D. 429 ; 49 L. J. P. & M. 67 ; 29 W. R. 306 ; 44 J. P. 735 | 213 |
| <i>Allkins v. Jupe</i> , L. R. 2 C. P. D. 375 ; 46 L. J. C. P. 824 ; 36 L. T. 851 | 7, 58 |
| <i>Allsopp v. Day</i> , 7 H. & N. 457 ; 31 L. J. Ex. 105 ; 8 Jur. N. S. 41 ; 5 L. T. 320 | 161 |
| <i>Almada Co., Re</i> , 38 Ch. D. 415 ; 57 L. J. Ch. 706 ; 1 Meg. 28 ; 59 L. T. 159 ; 36 W. R. 593 | 162 |
| <i>Alresford v. Scott</i> , 7 Q. B. D. 210 ; 50 L. J. M. C. 103 ; 45 L. T. 73 ; 29 W. R. 741 ; 45 J. P. 619 | 497 |
| <i>Alton Wood's Case</i> , 1 Rep. 47 | 215 |
| <i>Altrincham v. Cheshire Lines Com.</i> , 15 Q. B. D. 597 ; 50 J. P. 85 | 421 |
| <i>Amadie, The</i> , 1 Acton 240 | 203 |
| <i>Amalia, The</i> , 1 Moo. N. S. 471 ; B. & L. 151 ; 9 Jur. N. S. 1111 ; 12 W. R. 24 ; 8 L. T. 679 ; 32 L. J. Ad. 191 | 196, 208, 212 |
| <i>Ambergate Ry. Co. v. Midland Ry. Co.</i> , 2 El. & Bl. 793 ; 23 L. J. Q. B. 17 ; 18 Jur. 243 | 237 |

TABLE OF CASES.

XV

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| <i>American Fur Co. v. U. S.</i> , 2 Peters 367 | 369 |
| <i>Amherst v. Somers</i> , 2 T. R. 372 ; 1 R. R. 497 | 188 |
| <i>Amos, Re</i> , [1891] 3 Ch. 159 ; 65 L. T. 69 ; 39 W. R. 550 | 79 |
| <i>Ancketill v. Baylis</i> , 52 L. J. Q. B. 104 ; 48 L. T. 342 ; 31 W. R. 233 ; 10 Q. B. D. 577 ; 47 J. P. 356 ; 1 Colt. 289 | 281 |
| <i>Andalusian, The</i> , 3 P. D. 182 ; 47 L. J. Adm. 65 ; 39 L. T. 204 ; 27 W. R. 172 | 524 |
| <i>Anderson v. Bank of England</i> , 3 Bing. N. C. 539 ; 4 Scott 50 ; 2 Hodges 294 ; 1 Jur. 9 ; 2 Keen 328 | 161 |
| — <i>v. Hamlin</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 221 ; 59 L. J. M. C. 151 ; 63 L. T. 168 ; 54 J. P. 757 | 568, 577 |
| <i>Andrew, Re</i> , 1 Ch. D. 358 ; 45 L. J. Bkcy. 57 ; 33 L. T. 556 ; 24 W. R. 197 | 50 |
| — <i>v. Hancock</i> , 1 B & B. 37 ; 3 Moore 278 | 499 |
| <i>Anglo-Greek Steam Co., Re</i> , L. R. 2 Eq. 1 | 475 |
| <i>Anna, The</i> , 1 P. D. 253 ; 46 L. J. Adm. 15 ; 34 L. T. 895 | 424, 429 |
| <i>Annapolis, The</i> , Lush. 295 | 200 |
| <i>Anon.</i> , 1 Ventr. | 532 |
| —, Lofft. 465 | 234 |
| —, Skinn. 110 | 353 |
| —, 6 Mod. 27 | 575 |
| <i>Anstee v. Nelms</i> , 1 H. & N. 225 ; 26 L. J. Ex. 5 | 31 |
| <i>Anstey v. Edwards</i> , 16 C. B. 212 | 407 |
| <i>Antelope, The</i> , 10 Wheat. 66 | 203 |
| <i>Antony v. Cardenham</i> , 2 Bott. 194 | 96 |
| <i>Apothecaries Co. v. Jones</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 89 ; 67 L. T. 677 ; 41 W. R. 267 ; 57 J. P. 56 ; 17 Cox C. C. 588 | 377 |
| <i>Appleby v. Myers</i> , L. R. 1 C. P. 615 ; L. R. 2 C. P. 651 ; 36 L. J. C. P. 331 ; 16 L. T. 669 | 541 |
| <i>Archer v. James</i> , 2 B. & S. 61 ; 10 W. R. 565 | 5, 399 |
| <i>Armitage v. Walker</i> , 2 K. & J. 211 ; 2 Jur. N. S. 13 | 181 |
| <i>Armour v. Walker</i> , 25 Ch. D. 673 ; 53 L. J. Ch. 413 ; 50 L. T. 292 ; 32 W. R. 214 | 339 |
| <i>Armstrong v. Lewis</i> , 2 C. & M. 274 ; 4 M. & Scott 1 | 558 |
| <i>Armtyage v. Williamson or Wilkinson</i> , 3 App. Cas. 355 ; 47 L. J. C. P. 31 ; 38 L. T. 185 ; 26 W. R. 559 | 405 |
| <i>Arnold v. Arnold</i> , 2 M. & Cr. 256 ; 1 Jur. 255 | 206 |
| <i>Arnott v. Dimsdale</i> , 2 E. & B. 580 ; 22 L. J. M. C. 161 ; 17 Jur. 1157 | 516 |
| <i>Arrow Shipping Co. v. Tyne Commissioners</i> , [1894] A. C. 508 ; 63 L. J. P. 146 ; 71 L. T. 346 | 277 |
| <i>Arrowsmith, Ex parte</i> , 8 Ch. D. 96 ; 47 L. J. Bkcy. 46 ; 38 L. T. 547 ; 26 W. R. 600 | 110 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| Arthur Association, <i>Re</i> , L. R. 10 Ch. 542; 44 L. J. Ch. 569; 32 L. T. 713; 23 W. R. 939 | 296, 408 |
| — <i>v. Bokenam</i> , 11 Mod. 150 | 113 |
| Ascough's Case, Cro. Car. 525 | 187 |
| Ash <i>v. Abdy</i> , 3 Swanst. 664. | 36, 300, 407 |
| — <i>v. Lynn</i> , L. R. 1 Q. B. 270; 35 L. J. M. C. 159; 14 L. T. 224; 14 W. R. 583; 7 B. & S. 255 | 231 |
| Ashburnham <i>v. Bradshaw</i> , 2 Atk. 36 | 300 |
| Ashbury, &c. Co. <i>v. Riche</i> , L. R. 7 H. L. 653; 44 L. J. Ex. 185; 33 L. T. 451 | 464, 496, 539 |
| Ashby <i>v. White</i> , 1 Sm. L. C. (9th ed.) 268 | 575, 581 |
| Ashdown <i>v. Curtis</i> , 31 L. J. M. C. 216; 8 Jur. N. S. 511; 6 L. T. 331; 10 W. R. 667 | 544 |
| Ashenden <i>v. London & Br. Ry. Co.</i> , 5 Ex. D. 190; 42 L. T. 586; 28 W. R. 511; 44 J. P. 203 | 417 |
| Ashford <i>v. Thornton</i> , 1 B. & Ald. 405. | 592 |
| Atkins <i>v. Kilby</i> , 11 A. & E. 777 | 546 |
| Atkinson, <i>Re</i> , 21 Ch. D. 100; 51 L. J. Ch. 452; 46 L. T. 850; 30 W. R. 562 | 206, 207 |
| — <i>v. Abbott</i> , 11 East 135; 1 Camp. 535 | 559 |
| — <i>v. Bradford Bldg. Soc.</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 377; 59 L. J. Q. B. 360; 62 L. T. 857; 38 W. R. 630 | 360 |
| — <i>v. Newcastle Waterworks Co.</i> , 2 Ex. D. 441; 46 L. J. Ex. 775; 36 L. T. 761; 25 W. R. 794. | 580, 581 |
| — <i>v. Sellers</i> , 5 C. B. N. S. 442; 28 L. J. M. C. 12; 5 Jur. N. S. 21. | 93 |
| Attenborough <i>v. Thompson</i> , 27 L. J. Ex. 23; 2 H. & N. 559; 3 Jur. N. S. 1302 | 91 |
| Attorney-General <i>v. Alexander</i> , L. R. 10 Ex. 20; 44 L. J. Ex. 3; 31 L. T. 694; 23 W. R. 255 | 92 |
| — <i>v. Allgood</i> , Parker 3 | 187, 190 |
| — <i>v. Bailey</i> , 1 Ex. 281; 17 L. J. Ex. 9 | 82, 83 |
| — <i>v. Barker</i> , L. R. 7 Ex. 177; 41 L. J. Ex. 57; 26 L. T. 34; 20 W. R. 509 | 190 |
| — <i>v. Basingstoke</i> , 45 L. J. Ch. 726; 24 W. R. 817. | 570 |
| — <i>v. Bradbury</i> , 7 Ex. 97; 21 L. J. Ex. 12; 16 Jur. 130 | 404 |
| — <i>v. Bradlaugh</i> , 14 Q. B. D. 667; 54 L. J. Q. B. 205; 52 L. T. 589; 33 W. R. 673. | 456, 570 |
| — <i>v. Brecon</i> , 10 Ch. D. 204; 48 L. J. Ch. 153; 40 L. T. 52; 27 W. R. 332 | 502 |
| — <i>v. Bristol</i> , 2 Jac. & W. 321 | 425 |
| — <i>v. Cambridge</i> , L. R. 6 H. L. 303; 22 W. R. 37 | 422 |
| — <i>v. Campbell</i> , L. R. 5 H. L. 524; 41 L. J. Ch. 611; 21 W. R. 34 n. | 207 |

| | PAGE |
|---|----------------------------|
| Attorney-General v. Capell, 2 Show. 481 | 489 |
| — v. Chelsea Waterworks, Fitzg. 195 | 215 |
| — v. Constable, 4 Ex. D. 172; 48 L. J. Ex. 455; 27 W. R. 661 | 190 |
| — v. Davies, 9 Ves. 535; 7 R. R. 295 | 163 |
| — v. Day, 1 Ves. Sen. 221 | 360, 361 |
| — v. Donaldson, 10 M. & W. 117 | 187, 189, 190 |
| — v. Dorking, 20 Ch. D. 595; 51 L. J. Ch. 585 | 129 |
| — v. Edison Telephone Co., 6 Q. B. D. 244; 50 L. J. Q. B. 145; 43 L. T. 697; 29 W. R. 428 | 111 |
| — v. Emerson, 24 Q. B. D. 56; 59 L. J. Q. B. 192; 62 L. T. 21; 38 W. R. 102 | 175 |
| — v. Forster, 10 Ves. 338 | 424 |
| — v. Furness Ry. Co., 47 L. J. Ch. 776; 38 L. T. 555; 26 W. R. 650 | 420 |
| — v. G. E. Ry. Co., 11 Ch. D. 449; 48 L. J. Ch. 428; 40 L. T. 265 | 59 |
| — v. —, L. R. 7 Ch. 475; L. R. 6 H. L. 367; 41 L. J. Ch. 505; 26 L. T. 749; 20 W. R. 599 | 254 |
| — v. Hackney Board, L. R. 20 Eq. 626; 44 L. J. Ch. 545; 33 L. T. 244 | 280 |
| — v. Hallett, 2 H. & N. 368; 27 L. J. Ex. 89 | 76 |
| — v. Hertford, 3 Ex. 670; 18 L. J. Ex. 332 | 309 |
| — v. Hill, 2 M. & W. 160 | 189 |
| — v. Hooper, [1893] 3 Ch. 483; 63 L. J. Ch. 18; 69 L. T. 340; 57 J. P. 564 | 513 |
| — v. Horner, 14 Q. B. D. 254; 54 L. J. Q. B. 227; 33 W. R. 93; 49 J. P. 326 | 400 |
| — v. Jones, 2 H. & C. 347; 33 L. J. Ex. 249; 6 L. T. 655 | 424 |
| — v. Kwok Ah Sing, L. R. 5 P. C. 179; 42 L. J. P. C. 64; 29 L. T. 114; 12 Cox C. C. 565 | 34, 95, 121, 194, 320 |
| — v. Lamplough, 3 Ex. D. 214; 47 L. J. Ex. 555; 38 L. T. 87; 26 W. R. 323 | 51 |
| — v. Lloyd, 3 Atk. 551 | 300 |
| — v. Lockwood, 9 M. & W. 378; 10 Id. 464; 6 Jur. 171 | 6, 110, 232, 258, 319, 381 |
| — v. L. & N. W. Ry., 6 Q. B. D. 216; 50 L. J. Q. B. 170; 44 L. T. 236; 29 W. R. 346; 45 J. P. 390 | 406 |
| — v. Metrop. Ry. Co., [1894] 1 Q. B. 384; 69 L. T. 811; 42 W. R. 381; 58 J. P. 342 | 503 |
| — v. Napier, 6 Ex. 217; 12 L. J. Ex. 173; 15 Jur. 253 | 207 |
| — v. Panter, 6 Bro. P. C. 486 | 595 |
| — v. Parker, 3 Atk. 576 | 424 |
| — v. Saggars, 1 Pri. 182 | 382 |

| | PAGE |
|--|-------------|
| <i>Attorney-General v. Siddon</i> , 1 Cr. & J. 220; 1 Tyr. 41 . . . | 145 |
| — <i>v. Sillem</i> , 2 H. & C. 531; 10 Jur. N. S. 262; 33 L. J. Ex. 92; 12 W. R. 257; 11 L. T. N. S. 223 . . . | 33, 38, 314 |
| — <i>v. —</i> , 10 H. & C. 704; 10 Jur. N. S. 446; 10 L. T. 434 . . . | 414 |
| — <i>v. Smith</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 239; 62 L. J. 288; 68 L. T. 6; 41 W. R. 245; 57 J. P. 389 . . . | 403 |
| — <i>v. Southampton</i> , 17 Sim. 6 . . . | 179 |
| — <i>v. Theobald</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 557; 62 L. T. 768; 38 W. R. 527 . . . | 309 |
| — <i>v. Tyndall</i> , Ambl. 614 . . . | 57, 163 |
| — <i>v. Westminster (Mutual Tontine) Chambers Association</i> , 1 Ex. D. 469; 45 L. J. Ex. 886; 35 L. T. 224; 24 W. R. 996 . . . | 3, 54 |
| — <i>v. Weymouth</i> , Ambl. 22 . . . | 57 |
| <i>Attwater, Ex parte</i> , 5 Ch. D. 27; 46 L. J. Bkcy. 41; 35 L. T. 682; 25 W. R. 206 . . . | 5, 229, 433 |
| <i>Attree v. Hawe</i> , 9 Ch. D. 337; 47 L. J. Ch. 863; 38 L. T. 733; 26 W. R. 871 . . . | 164 |
| <i>Auckland, Lord, v. Westminster Board of Works</i> , L. R. 7 Ch. 597; 41 L. J. Ch. 723; 26 L. T. 961; 20 W. R. 845 . . . | 43 |
| <i>Austen v. Howard</i> , 7 Taunt. 28 & 327; 2 Marsh 352 . . . | 237 |
| <i>Austin v. Bunyard</i> , 6 B. & S. 687; 34 L. J. Q. B. 217; 11 Jur. N. S. 879; 12 L. T. 452; 13 W. R. 773 . . . | 171, 273 |
| — <i>v. Mills</i> , 9 Ex. 288; 2 C. L. R. 411; 23 L. J. Ex. 40; 18 Jur. 16 . . . | 181 |
| <i>Avanzo v. Mudie</i> , 10 Ex. 203 . . . | 522 |
| <i>Avery v. Wood</i> , [1891] 3 Ch. 115; 65 L. T. 122; 39 W. R. 577 . . . | 433 |
| <i>Ayr Harbour Trustees v. Oswald</i> , 8 App. Cas. 623 . . . | 420 |

B.

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Backwell's Case</i> , 1 Vernon 152 . . . | 336 |
| <i>Badcock v. Hunt</i> , 22 Q. B. D. 145; 58 L. J. Q. B. 134; 60 L. T. 314; 37 W. R. 205; 53 J. P. 340 . . . | 76 |
| <i>Baddeley v. Earl Granville</i> , 19 Q. B. D. 423; 56 L. J. Q. B. 501; 57 L. T. 268; 38 W. R. 63; 51 J. P. 822 . . . | 548 |
| <i>Bagg's Case</i> , 11 Rep. 99 . . . | 511 |
| <i>Bagge v. Whitehead</i> , [1892] 2 Q. B. 355; 61 L. J. Q. B. 778; 66 L. T. 815; 40 W. R. 472; 56 J. P. 548 . . . | 144 |
| <i>Bailey v. Harris</i> , 12 Q. B. 905; 18 L. J. Q. B. 115; 13 Jur. 341 . . . | 563 |
| — <i>v. Sweeting</i> , 9 C. B. N. S. 843; 30 L. J. C. P. 150; 9 W. R. 273 . . . | 409 |
| <i>Baily v. De Crespigny</i> , L. R. 4 Q. B. 180; 38 L. J. Q. B. 98; 19 L. T. 681; 17 W. R. 494 . . . | 553 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Baines v. Swainson , 4 B. & S. 270 ; 32 L. J. Q. B. 281 ; 8 L. T. 536 ; 11 W. R. 208 | 123 |
| — <i>v. Wormsley</i> , 47 L. J. Ch. 844 ; 39 L. T. 85 ; 27 W. R. 36 | 338 |
| Baird v. Tunbridge Wells , [1894] 2 Q. B. 867 ; 71 L. T. 211 ; 59 J. P. 36 | 129, 435 |
| Baker, Re , 2 H. & N. 219 | 259 |
| —, <i>Re</i> , 44 Ch. D. 262 ; 59 L. J. Ch. 661 ; 62 L. T. 817 ; 38 W. R. 417 | 344 |
| — <i>v. Berkeley</i> , 3 C. & P. 32 | 451 |
| — <i>v. Yorks. Ass. Co.</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 144 ; 61 L. J. Q. B. 838 ; 66 L. T. 161 | 270 |
| Baldwin, Ex parte , 2 De G. & J. 230 ; 27 L. J. Bkcy. 17 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 522 | 86 |
| Ball, Ex parte , 20 Ch. D. 670 ; 51 L. J. Ch. 911 ; 47 L. T. 213 ; 30 W. R. 738 | 172 |
| Balls v. Attwood , 1 H. Bl. 546 | 183 |
| Bancroft v. Mitchell , L. R. 2 Q. B. 549 ; 36 L. J. Q. B. 257 ; 16 L. T. 558 ; 15 W. R. 1132 ; 8 B. & S. 558 | 78 |
| Bane v. Methuen , 2 Bing. 63 ; 9 Moore 161 | 500 |
| Bank of England v. Anderson , 3 Bing. N. C. 589 ; 2 Hodges 294 ; 4 Scott 50 ; 1 Jur. 9 ; 2 Keen 328 | 423 |
| — <i>v. Vagliano</i> , [1891] App. Cas. 107 ; 60 L. J. Q. B. 145 ; 64 L. T. 353 ; 39 W. R. 657 | 36, 84 |
| Bank of U.S. v. Donnally , 8 Peters 361 | 212 |
| Bankes v. Small , 36 Ch. D. 916 ; 56 L. J. Ch. 832 ; 57 L. T. 292 ; 35 W. R. 765 | 122 |
| Banks v. Hollingsworth , [1893] 1 Q. B. 443 ; 62 L. J. Q. B. 239 ; 68 L. T. 477 ; 41 W. R. 225 ; 57 J. P. 436 | 130 |
| Barber v. Gamson , 4 B. & Ald. 281 | 339, 349 |
| — <i>v. Waite</i> , 1 A. & E. 514 ; 3 N. & M. 611 | 76 |
| Barclay, Ex parte , L. R. 9 Ch. 567 ; 43 L. J. Ch. 449 ; 30 L. T. 479 ; 22 W. R. 608 | 132 |
| Barker v. Palmer , 8 Q. B. D. 9 ; 45 L. T. 480 ; 30 W. R. 59 | 526 |
| Barlow v. Ross , 24 Q. B. D. 381 ; 59 L. J. Q. B. 183 ; 62 L. T. 552 ; 38 W. R. 372 ; 54 J. P. 660 | 95, 98 |
| — <i>v. Teal</i> , 15 Q. B. D. 403 ; 54 L. J. Q. B. 400 ; 53 L. T. 52 | 433 |
| — <i>v. Terrett</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 107 ; 60 L. J. M. C. 104 ; 65 L. T. 148 ; 39 W. R. 640 ; 55 J. P. 632 | 377 |
| Barnardo v. Ford , [1892] A. C. 326 ; 61 L. J. Q. B. 728 ; 67 L. T. 1 ; 56 J. P. 629 | 288 |
| Barnes v. Ackroyd , L. R. 7 Q. B. 474 ; 41 L. J. M. C. 110 ; 26 L. T. 692 ; 20 W. R. 671 | 104 |
| — <i>v. Shore</i> , 8 Q. B. 640 ; 17 L. J. Q. B. 296 ; 10 Jur. 688 | 122 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Barrack <i>v.</i> McCulloch, 26 L. J. Ch. 105; 3 Kay & J. 110; 3 Jur. N. S. 180 | 110 |
| Barrow, <i>Ex parte</i> , 3 Ves. Jun. 554 | 116 |
| — <i>v.</i> Wadkin, 24 Beav. 327; 27 L. J. Ch. 129 | 58 |
| Bartlett <i>v.</i> Vinor, Carth. 252 | 554, 555 |
| — <i>v.</i> Kirkwood, 2 E. & B. 771; 2 C. L. R. 253; 23 L. J. Q. B. 9; 18 Jur. 173 | 514 |
| Barton Regis <i>v.</i> Liverpool, 3 Q. B. D. 295; 47 L. J. M. C. 62; 37 L. T. 713; 26 W. R. 382 | 302 |
| Barton <i>v.</i> Pigott, L. R. 10 Q. B. 86; 44 L. J. M. C. 5; 31 L. T. 404; 23 W. R. 233 | 174, 335, 557 |
| — <i>v.</i> Port Jackson Co., 17 Barbour N. York R. 397 | 562 |
| Barwick <i>v.</i> London S. Bank, L. R. 2 Ex. 259; 36 L. J. Ex. 147; 16 L. T. 461; 15 W. R. 877 | 104 |
| Bateman <i>v.</i> Mid Wales Ry. Co., L. R. 1 C. P. 499; 35 L. J. C. P. 205; 12 Jur. N. S. 453; 14 W. R. 672 | 506 |
| — <i>v.</i> Service, 6 App. Cas. 386 | 204 |
| Bates <i>v.</i> Bates, 14 P. D. 17; 58 L. J. P. 85; 60 L. T. 125; 37 W. R. 230 | 78 |
| — <i>v.</i> Winstanley, 4 M. & S. 429 | 225 |
| Bath <i>v.</i> Berwick, [1892] 1 Q. B. 731; 61 L. J. M. C. 137; 66 L. T. 258; 40 W. R. 414; 56 J. P. 296 | 299 |
| — <i>v.</i> White, 3 C. P. D. 175; 26 W. R. 617 | 167 |
| Batt <i>v.</i> Price, 1 Q. B. D. 264; 45 L. J. Q. B. 170; 33 L. T. 808; 24 W. R. 318 | 572 |
| Battersby <i>v.</i> Kirk, 1 Hodges 451; 2 Bing. N. C. 584; 3 Scott 11 | 21 |
| Battishill <i>v.</i> Reed, 18 C. B. 696; 25 L. J. C. P. 290 | 490 |
| Battye <i>v.</i> Gresley, 8 East 319 | 517 |
| Baum, <i>Re</i> , 7 Ch. D. 719; 47 L. J. Bkey. 48; 38 L. T. 367; 26 W. R. 568 | 172 |
| Baumann <i>v.</i> James, L. R. 3 Ch. 508; 18 L. T. 424; 16 W. R. 877 | 31 |
| Baxendale <i>v.</i> G. E. Ry. Co., L. R. 4 Q. B. 244; 38 L. J. Q. B. 137; 17 W. R. 412 | 286 |
| — <i>v.</i> Hart, 6 Ex. 769; 21 L. J. Ex. 123; 16 Jur. 126 | 330 |
| Beal, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 387; 37 L. J. Q. B. 161; 18 L. T. 285; 16 W. R. 852; 9 B. & S. 395 | 390 |
| — <i>v.</i> Ford, 3 C. P. D. 59; 47 L. J. C. P. 56; 37 L. T. 408; 26 W. R. 146; 2 Hop. & C. 374 | 89 |
| — <i>v.</i> Town Clerk of Exeter, 20 Q. B. D. 300; 57 L. J. Q. B. 128; 58 L. T. 407; 36 W. R. 507; 1 Fox 31 | 90 |
| Beard <i>v.</i> Knight, 8 E. & B. 865; 27 L. J. Q. B. 359; 4 Jur. N. S. 782 | 443 |
| — <i>v.</i> Rowan, 9 Peters 317 | 59, 60 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xxi

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------|
| <i>Beanfort v. Swansea, Mayor of</i> , 3 Ex. 413 | 431 |
| <i>Becke v. Smith</i> , 2 M. & W. 191 | 3, 319, 323 |
| <i>Beckett v. Midland Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 3 C. P. 94; 36 L. J. C. P. 40; 15 L. T. 572; 15 W. R. 404 | 130 |
| — <i>v. Tower Assets Co.</i> , [1891] 1 Q. B. 638; 60 L. J. Q. B. 493; 55 J. P. 438; 64 L. T. 497; 39 W. R. 438 | 160 |
| <i>Beckford v. Hood</i> , 7 T. R. 620; 4 R. R. 527 | 576 |
| — <i>v. Wade</i> , 17 Ves. 91 | 118 |
| <i>Beckham v. Drake</i> , 2 H. L. 579; 11 M. & W. 315; 12 L. J. Ex. 486; 13 Jur. 921 | 271 |
| <i>Beckwith v. Talbot</i> , 5 Otto 289 | 408 |
| <i>Beddow v. Beddow</i> , 9 Ch. D. 89; 47 L. J. Ch. 558; 26 W. R. 570 | 114 |
| <i>Bedo v. Sanderson</i> , Cro. Jac. 440. | 159 |
| <i>Beds v. St. Paul</i> , 7 Ex. 650 | 189 |
| <i>Beer v. London and Paris Hotel Co.</i> , L. R. 20 Eq. 412; 32 L. T. 715. | 408 |
| <i>Beeston v. Beeston</i> , 1 Ex. D. 13; 45 L. J. Ex. 230; 33 L. T. 700; 24 W. R. 96 | 559 |
| <i>Behn v. Burness</i> , 3 B. & S. 751; 32 L. J. Q. B. 207; 8 L. T. 207; 9 Jur. N. S. 620 | 32 |
| <i>Belasco v. Haunant</i> , 3 B. & S. 13; 31 L. J. M. C. 225; 9 Cox C. C. 203; 10 W. R. 867; 8 Jur. N. S. 1226 | 62 |
| <i>Bell v. Bilton</i> , 4 Bing. 615 | 310 |
| — <i>v. Crane</i> , L. R. 8 Q. B. 481; 42 L. J. M. C. 122; 29 L. T. 207; 21 W. R. 911 | 346 |
| — <i>v. Earl of Dudley</i> , [1895] 1 Ch. 182; 64 L. J. Ch. 291; 72 L. T. 14; 43 W. R. 122. | 503 |
| <i>Bellamy v. Debenham</i> , 45 Ch. D. 481; 63 L. T. 220 | 408 |
| — <i>v. Hoyle</i> , L. R. 10 Ex. 220; 44 L. J. Ex. 169; 33 L. T. 21; 23 W. R. 754 | 501 |
| — <i>v. Saull</i> , 4 B. & S. 265; 32 L. J. Q. B. 366; 8 L. T. 534; 11 W. R. 800 | 536 |
| <i>Bell-Cox v. Hakes</i> , 15 App. Cas. 506; 60 L. J. Q. B. 89; 63 L. T. 392; 39 W. R. 145; 54 J. P. 820; 17 Cox C. C. 158 36, 126, 353 | |
| <i>Bence, Re</i> , [1891] 3 Ch. 242; 60 L. J. Ch. 636; 65 L. T. 530 | 448 |
| <i>Benfieldside Local Board v. Consett Iron Co.</i> , 3 Ex. D. 54; 47 L. J. Ex. 49; 26 W. R. 114; 38 L. T. 530 | 44 |
| <i>Benjamin v. Storr</i> , L. R. 9 C. P. 400; 43 L. J. C. P. 162; 30 L. T. 362; 22 W. R. 631 | 582 |
| <i>Bennett v. Atkins</i> , 4 C. P. D. 80; 48 L. J. C. P. 95; 40 L. T. 66 27 W. R. 231 | 550 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| Bennett <i>v.</i> Brunfitt, L. R. 3 C. P. 28 ; 37 L. J. C. P. 35 ; 17 L. T. 213 ; 16 W. R. 131 ; 1 H. & P. 407 | 53 |
| — <i>v.</i> Daniel, 10 B. & C. 500 | 295, 455 |
| — <i>v.</i> Edwards, 7 B. & C. 586 ; 1 M. & R. 482 ; 6 Bing. 230 | 110, 392 |
| — <i>v.</i> Watson, 3 M. & S. 1. | 116 |
| Bensley <i>v.</i> Bignold, 5 B. & A. 335 | 561 |
| Bent <i>v.</i> Roberts, 3 Ex. D. 66 ; 47 L. J. Ex. 112 ; 37 L. T. 673 ; 26 W. R. 128 | 93 |
| Bentham <i>v.</i> Hoyle, 3 Q. B. D. 289 ; 47 L. J. M. C. 51 ; 37 L. T. 753 ; 26 W. R. 314 | 417 |
| Bentley <i>v.</i> Rotherham Local Board, 4 Ch. D. 588 ; 46 L. J. Ch. 284 | 57, 63 |
| Benwell, <i>Ex parte</i> , 14 Q. B. D. 301 ; 54 L. J. Q. B. 53 ; 51 L. T. 677 ; 33 W. R. 242 | 463 |
| Beresford Hope <i>v.</i> Sandhurst, 23 Q. B. D. 79 ; 58 L. J. Q. B. 316 ; 61 L. T. 150 ; 37 W. R. 548 ; 53 J. P. 805 | 115, 116, 117 |
| Berkeley <i>v.</i> Elderkin, 1 El. & Bl. 805 ; 22 L. J. Q. B. 281 ; 17 Jur. 1153 | 181 |
| Berkeley Peerage, 4 H. L. 21 ; 8 Jur. N. S. 21 ; 4 L. T. 686 | 287 |
| Berkley <i>v.</i> Thompson, 10 App. Cas. 45 ; 54 L. J. M. C. 65 ; 52 L. T. 1 ; 33 W. R. 525 ; 49 J. P. 276 | 197 |
| Berwick <i>v.</i> Andrews, 2 Ld. Raym. 971 | 356 |
| Bessey <i>v.</i> Windham, 6 Q. B. 166 ; 14 L. J. Q. B. 7 | 293 |
| Best, <i>Ex parte</i> , 18 Ch. D. 488 ; 45 L. T. 95 | 549 |
| — <i>v.</i> Pembroke, L. R. 8 Q. B. 363 ; 42 L. J. Q. B. 212 ; 29 L. T. 327 ; 21 W. R. 919 | 49 |
| Beta, The, 3 Moo. P. C. C. N. S. 23 ; 34 L. J. Adm. 76 ; 12 L. T. 1 | 327 |
| Betham <i>v.</i> Gregg, 10 Bing. 352 ; 4 M. & Scott 230 | 297 |
| Betts <i>v.</i> Armstead, 20 Q. B. D. 771 ; 57 L. J. M. C. 100 ; 58 L. T. 811 ; 36 W. R. 720 ; 52 J. P. 471 | 143 |
| Biddell <i>v.</i> Leeder, 1 B. & C. 327 | 565 |
| Biddulph <i>v.</i> St. George's Vestry, 33 L. J. Ch. 411 ; 9 Jur. N. S. 434 ; 8 L. T. 44 ; 11 W. R. 524 | 171 |
| Biffin <i>v.</i> Yorke, 5 M. & G. R. 428 ; 6 Scott N. R. 234 | |
| Biggs <i>v.</i> Mitchell, 2 B. & S. 523 ; 31 L. J. M. C. 163 ; 8 Jur. N. S. 817 ; 6 L. T. 242 ; 10 W. R. 559 | 466 |
| Bill <i>v.</i> Bament, 9 M. & W. 36 | 408 |
| Billings <i>v.</i> Prinn, 2 W. Bl. 1017 | 517 |
| Bills <i>v.</i> Smith, 6 B. & S. 314 ; 34 L. J. Q. B. 68 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 154 ; 12 L. T. 22 ; 13 W. R. 407 | 162 |
| Binns <i>v.</i> Hey, 1 D. & L. 661 ; 13 L. J. Q. B. 28 ; 7 Jur. 1154 | 316 |
| Binstead, <i>Re</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 199 ; 68 L. T. 31 ; 41 W. R. 452 ; 9 M. B. R. 319 ; 62 L. J. Q. B. 207 | 76 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xxiii

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| <i>Birch v. Lake</i> , 1 Mod. 185 | 223 |
| <i>Bird v. Adcock</i> , 47 L. J. M. C. 123 ; 26 W. R. 634 | 254, 591 |
| — <i>v. Davey</i> , [1891] 1 Q. B. 29 ; 63 L. J. 741 ; 60 L. J. Q. B. 8 ; 39 W. R. 40 | 11 |
| <i>Birkenhead Docks v. Laird</i> , 4 De G. M. & G. 732 ; 23 L. J. Ch. 457 ; 18 Jur. 883 | 254 |
| <i>Birkmyr v. Darnell</i> , 1 Sm. L. C. 310 | 209 |
| <i>Birley v. Chorlton</i> , 3 Beav. 499 | 179 |
| <i>Birmingham v. Shaw</i> , 10 Q. B. 868 ; 3 New Sess. Cas. 445 ; 18 L. J. M. C. 89 ; 13 Jur. 357 | 266 |
| <i>Bishop v. Bryant</i> , 6 C. & P. 484 | 546 |
| — <i>v. Curtis</i> , 18 Q. B. 878 ; 21 L. J. Q. B. 391 ; 17 Jur. 23 | 118 |
| <i>Bishops, Case of</i> , 12 Rep. 7 | 585 |
| <i>Blackburn v. Parkinson</i> , 1 E. & E. 71 ; 28 L. J. M. C. 7 | 183 |
| <i>Blackmore v. Mile End Vestry</i> , 9 Q. B. D. 451 ; 51 L. J. Q. B. 496 ; 46 L. T. 869 ; 30 W. R. 740 | 584 |
| <i>Blackwell v. England</i> , 27 L. J. Q. B. 124 ; 8 E. & B. 541 ; 3 Jur. N. S. 1302 | 91 |
| <i>Blackwood v. R.</i> , 8 App. Cas. 82 ; 52 L. J. P. C. 10 ; 48 L. T. 441 ; 31 W. R. 645 | 42 |
| <i>Blaiberg, Ex parte</i> , 23 Ch. D. 254 ; 52 L. J. Ch. 461 ; 49 L. T. 16 ; 31 W. R. 906 | 295 |
| <i>Blain, Ex parte</i> , 12 Ch. D. 512 ; 41 L. T. 46 ; 28 W. R. 334 | 204 |
| <i>Blake v. Attersoll</i> , 2 B. & C. 875 | 468 |
| — <i>v. Midland Ry.</i> , 18 Q. B. 109 ; 21 L. J. Q. B. 233 ; 16 Jur. 562 | 58 |
| <i>Blakemore v. Glamorganshire Canal Co.</i> , 1 M. & K. 154 | 420 |
| <i>Blaker v. Tillstone</i> , [1894] 1 Q. B. 345 ; 63 L. J. M. C. 72 ; 70 L. T. 31 ; 42 W. R. 253 ; 58 J. P. 184 | 142 |
| <i>Blanchett, Ex parte</i> , 17 Q. B. D. 303 ; 55 L. J. Q. B. 327 ; 34 W. R. 438 ; 3 M. B. R. 157 | 498 |
| <i>Blankley v. Winstanley</i> , 3 T. R. 279 ; 1 R. R. 704 | 424 |
| <i>Blithman, Re</i> , L. R. 2 Eq. 23 ; 35 L. J. Ch. 255 ; 12 Jur. N. S. 84 ; 14 L. T. 6 ; 35 Beav. 219 | 205 |
| <i>Bloxam v. Favre</i> , 9 P. D. 130 ; 53 L. J. P. 26 ; 50 L. T. 766 ; 32 W. R. 673 | 205 |
| <i>Bloxome v. Williams</i> , 3 B. & C. 232 ; 5 D. & R. 82 ; 1 C. & P. 294 295, 556 | |
| <i>Blundell v. Gladstone</i> , 3 McN. & Gor. 692 | 31 |
| <i>Blunt v. Heslop</i> , 3 N. & P. 553 | 487 |
| <i>Blyth v. Birmingham Waterworks</i> , 11 Ex. 781 ; 25 L. J. Ex. 212 ; 2 Jur. N. S. 333 | 503 |
| <i>Boast v. Firth</i> , L. R. 4 C. P. 1 ; 38 L. J. C. P. 1 ; 19 L. T. 264 ; 17 W. R. 29 | 541 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| Boldero v. Jackson, 11 East 612 | 159 |
| Bolina, The, 1 Gallison 83 | 370 |
| Bolland, <i>Ex parte</i> , <i>In re</i> Roper, 21 Ch. D. 543 ; 52 L. J. Ch. 113 ; 47 L. T. 488 ; 31 W. R. 102 | 23 |
| Bolton v. Bolton, 2 Ch. D. 217 ; 34 L. T. 123 ; 24 W. R. 426 | 548 |
| Bonaker v. Evans, 16 Q. B. 163 ; 20 L. J. Q. B. 137 ; 15 Jur. 460 | 514 |
| Bonar v. Mitchell, 5 Ex. 415 ; 19 L. J. Ex. 302 | 539 |
| Bond v. Bond, 29 L. J. P. M. & A. 143 ; 2 S. & T. 93 ; 8 W. R. 630 | 198 |
| — v. Evans, 21 Q. B. D. 249 ; 57 L. J. M. C. 105 ; 59 L. T. 411 ; 36 W. R. 767 52 J. P. 612 | 146, 389 |
| — v. Hopkins, 1 Sch. & Lef. 433 | 361 |
| — v. Rosling, 1 B. & S. 371 ; 30 L. J. Q. B. 227 ; 4 L. T. 442 ; 9 W. R. 746 | 457 |
| — v. St. George, L. R. 6 C. P. 314 ; 40 L. J. C. P. 47 ; 23 L. T. 494 ; 19 W. R. 101 ; 1 Hop. & C. 427 | 90 |
| Bonella v. Twickenham Bd., 20 Q. B. D. 63 ; 57 L. J. M. C. 1 ; 58 L. T. 299 ; 36 W. R. 50 ; 52 J. P. 356 | 285 |
| Bones v. Booth, 2 W. Bl. 1226 | 448 |
| Bonham's Case, 8 Rep. 118 a | 114, 208, 364 |
| Bonner v. G. W. R., 24 Ch. D. 1 ; 48 L. T. 619 ; 32 W. R. 190 ; 47 J. P. 580 | 418 |
| Bonnewell v. Jenkins, 8 Ch. D. 70 ; 47 L. J. Ch. 758 ; 38 L. T. 81 ; 26 W. R. 294 | 408 |
| Bonomi v. Backhouse, 9 H. L. 503 ; E. B. & E. 622 ; 27 L. J. Q. B. 378 ; 28 Id. 380 ; 34 Id. 181 ; 7 Jur. N. S. 809 ; 9 W. R. 769 | 8 |
| Boodle v. Davis, 8 Ex. 351 | 315 |
| Boon v. Howard, L. R. 9 C. P. 277 ; 43 L. J. C. P. 115 ; 29 L. T. 382 ; 22 W. R. 535 ; 2 Hop. & C. 208 | 277, 354 |
| Booth v. Bank of England, 7 Cl. & F. 509 ; 2 Scott N. R. 701 ; 6 Bing. N. C. 415 ; 4 Jur. 762 | 162 |
| — v. Clive, 10 C. B. 827 ; 2 L. M. & P. 283 ; 20 L. J. C. P. 151 ; 15 Jur. 563 | 325 |
| — v. Ferrett, 25 Q. B. D. 87 ; 59 L. J. M. C. 136 ; 63 L. T. 346 ; 38 W. R. 718 ; 55 J. P. 7 | 134 |
| — v. Ibbotson, 1 Yo. & J. 360 | 423 |
| — v. Trail, 12 Q. B. D. 8 ; 53 L. J. Q. B. 24 ; 49 L. T. 471 ; 32 W. R. 122 | 572 |
| Boothroyd, <i>Re</i> , 15 M. & W. 1 ; 15 L. J. M. C. 57 ; 10 Jur. 117 | 353 |
| Bosanquet v. Woodford, 5 Q. B. 310 ; D. & M. 419 ; 13 L. J. Q. B. 93 ; 8 Jur. 242 | 537 |
| Bosley v. Davies, 1 Q. B. D. 84 ; 45 L. J. M. C. 27 ; 33 L. T. 528 ; 24 W. R. 140 | 272, 454 |

TABLE OF CASES.

XXV

| | PAGE |
|--|----------------------|
| <i>Bostock v. Staffordshire Ry. Co.</i> , 3 Sm. & G. 283; 25 L. J. Ch. 325; 3 Jur. N. S. 245 | 418 |
| <i>Bottomley's Case</i> , 16 Ch. D. 681; 50 L. J. Ch. 167; 43 L. T. 620; 29 W. R. 133 | 525 |
| <i>Boucicault v. Chatterton</i> , 5 Ch. D. 275; 43 L. J. Ch. 305; 35 L. T. 745; 25 W. R. 287 | 77 |
| <i>Bound v. Lawrance</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 226; 61 L. J. M. C. 21; 65 L. T. 844; 40 W. R. 1; 56 J. P. 118 | 470 |
| <i>Bowlby v. Bell</i> , 3 C. B. 284; 4 Rly. Cas. 692; 16 L. J. C. P. 18; 10 Jur. 669 | 462 |
| <i>Bowman v. Blyth</i> , 7 E. & B. 26, 47; 26 L. J. M. C. 57; 10 Jur. N. S. 359 | 127, 520, 533 |
| <i>Bows v. Fenwick</i> , L. R. 9 C. P. 339; 43 L. J. M. C. 107; 30 L. T. 524; 22 W. R. 804 | 98, 481 |
| <i>Bowyer v. Bampton</i> , 2 Stra. 1155 | 290 |
| <i>Boyce v. Higgins</i> , 14 C. B. 1; 23 L. J. C. P. 5; 18 Jur. 333 | 268 |
| <i>Boydell v. Drummond</i> , 11 East 142; 2 Campb. 157; 10 R. R. 450 | 361, 408 |
| <i>Boyfield v. Porter</i> , 13 East 200; 12 R. R. 324 | 181 |
| <i>Brace v. Abercarn Colliery Co.</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 699; 60 L. J. Q. B. 706; 40 W. R. 3; 56 J. P. 20 | 453 |
| <i>Bracey's Case</i> , 1 Salk. 348 | 369 |
| <i>Bradbury v. Hotten</i> , L. R. 8 Ex. 1; 42 L. J. Ex. 28; 27 L. T. 450; 21 W. R. 126 | 272 |
| <i>Bradford Union v. Wiltz</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 604; 37 L. J. M. C. 129; 18 L. T. 514; 16 W. R. 1197 | 284 |
| <i>Bradlaugh, Ex parte</i> , 3 Q. B. D. 509; 47 L. J. M. C. 105; 38 L. T. 680; 26 W. R. 758 | 180 |
| — <i>v. Clarke</i> , 8 App. Cas. 354; 52 L. J. Q. B. 505; 48 L. T. 681; 47 J. P. 405; 31 W. R. 677 | 3, 52, 359, 449, 568 |
| <i>Bradley v. Baylis</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 195; 51 L. J. Q. B. 183; 46 L. T. 253; 30 W. R. 823; 45 J. P. 847; 1 Colt. 163 | 93 |
| — <i>v. Greenwich Board</i> , 3 Q. B. D. 384; 47 L. J. M. C. 111; 38 L. T. 849; 26 W. R. 693 | 21 |
| — <i>v. Newcastle Pilots etc.</i> , 2 E. & B. 427; 23 L. J. Q. B. 35 | 431 |
| — <i>v. Southampton Board</i> , 4 E. & B. 1014; 24 L. J. Q. B. 242; 6 Jur. N. S. 696; 8 W. R. 584 | 184 |
| <i>Bradshaw v. Lanc. & York. Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 10 C. P. 189; 44 L. J. C. P. 148; 31 L. T. 847 | 356 |
| <i>Brain v. Thomas</i> , 50 L. J. Q. B. 662 | 575 |
| <i>Brall, Re</i> , [1893] 2 Q. B. 381; 62 L. J. Q. B. 457; 69 L. T. 323; 41 W. R. 623; 10 M. B. R. 166 | 293, 456 |
| <i>Bramston v. Colchester</i> , 6 El. & Bl. 246; 25 L. J. M. C. 73; 2 Jur. N. S. 809 | 252 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| <i>Brand v. Hammersmith Ry. Co.</i> , 4 H. L. 171; 38 L. J. Q. B. 265; 21 L. T. 238; 18 W. R. 12 | 131, 286 |
| <i>Brandling v. Barrington</i> , 6 B. & C. 475 | 362 |
| <i>Brandon, Re</i> , 9 App. Cas. 589; 53 L. J. P. C. 84 | 302 |
| <i>Braneth v. Havering</i> , Duke on Charit. Uses, p. 83 | 118 |
| <i>Brantom v. Griffiths</i> , 1 C. P. D. 349; 2 C. P. D. 212; 46 L. J. C. P. 408; 36 L. T. 4; 29 W. R. 313 | 161, 435 |
| <i>Branwell v. Penneck</i> , 7 B. & C. 536; 1 M. & R. 409 | 470 |
| <i>Bray v. Lancashire J.J.</i> , 22 Q. B. D. 484; 58 L. J. M. C. 54; 37 W. R. 392; 53 J. P. 499 | 189 |
| <i>Brenan's Case</i> , 10 Q. B. 492; 11 Jur. 775; 16 L. J. Q. B. 285 | 530 |
| <i>Brett v. Brett</i> , 3 Add. 210 | 58, 63 |
| <i>Breuil, Ex parte</i> , 16 Ch. D. 484; 50 L. J. Ch. 384; 43 L. T. 580; 29 W. R. 299 | 91 |
| <i>Brewster v. Kitchell</i> , 1 Salk. 198 | 551, 552 |
| <i>Bridge v. Branch</i> , 1 C. P. D. 633; 34 L. T. 905 | 180, 443 |
| <i>Bridgeman v. Fitzgerald</i> , 50 L. J. Ch. 9 | 473 |
| <i>Bridger, Re</i> , [1894] 1 Ch. 297; 63 L. J. Ch. 186; 70 L. T. 204; 42 W. R. 179 | 300 |
| — <i>v. Richardson</i> , 2 M. & S. 568 | 466 |
| — <i>v. Savage</i> , 15 Q. B. D. 363; 54 L. J. Q. B. 464; 53 L. T. 129; 33 W. R. 891; 49 J. P. 725 | 558 |
| <i>Brig Ann, The</i> , 1 Gallison 62 | 595 |
| <i>Brigden v. Heighes</i> , 1 Q. B. D. 330; 45 L. J. M. C. 58; 34 L. T. 242; 24 W. R. 272 | 167, 272 |
| <i>Brighton Guardians v. Strand Guardians</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 156; 60 L. J. M. C. 105; 64 L. T. 722; 39 W. R. 581; 55 J. P. 743 | 445 |
| <i>Brighty v. Norton</i> , 3 B. & S. 305; 32 L. J. Q. B. 38; 9 Jur. N. S. 495; 7 L. T. 422; 11 W. R. 167 | 387 |
| <i>Bristol Aërated Bread Co. v. Maggs</i> , 44 Ch. D. 616; 59 L. J. Ch. 472; 62 L. T. 416; 38 W. R. 574; 2 Meg. 150, 205 | 408 |
| <i>Britain v. Rossiter</i> , 11 Q. B. D. 128; 48 L. J. Ex. 362; 40 L. T. 240; 27 W. R. 482 | 361 |
| <i>British Farmers' Co., Re</i> , 3 App. Cas. 1004; 48 L. J. Ch. 56; 39 L. T. 308; 26 W. R. 819 | 4 |
| — <i>Linen Co. v. Drummond</i> , 10 B. & C. 903 | 213 |
| <i>Britt v. Robinson</i> , L. R. 5 C. P. 503; 39 L. J. C. P. 265; 23 L. T. 188; 18 W. R. 866 | 393 |
| <i>Britton v. Ward</i> , 2 Rol. 127 | 369 |
| <i>Broadbent v. Imperial Gas Co.</i> , 9 De G. M. & G. 436; 26 L. J. Ch. 276; 3 Jur. N. S. 221 | 72 |
| <i>Broadhead v. Holdsworth</i> , 2 Ex. D. 321; 46 L. J. M. C. 172; 36 L. T. 320 | 385 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xxvii

| | PAGE |
|---|--------------|
| Brockback v. Whitehaven Ry. Co. , 7 H. & N. 834; 31 L. J. Ex. 349 | 345 |
| Brockelbank, Re , 23 Q. B. D. 461; 58 L. J. Q. B. 375; 61 L. T. 543; 37 W. R. 537; 6 M. B. R. 138 | 279, 331 |
| Brocklehurst v. Lowe , 7 E. & B. 176; 26 L. J. Q. B. 107; 3 Jur. N. S. 436 | 123 |
| Brockwell v. Bullock , 22 Q. B. D. 567; 58 L. J. Q. B. 289; 37 W. R. 455; 53 J. P. 405 | 235 |
| Brodie v. Chandos , 1 Bro. C. C. 444 n. | 163 |
| Bromley v. Holden, Moo. & M. 175 | 574 |
| Brook v. Brook , 9 H. L. 193; 27 L. J. Ch. 401; 7 Jur. N. S. 422; 9 W. R. 461; 4 L. T. 93 | 195, 198 |
| — v. Shadgate , L. R. 8 Q. B. 352; 42 L. J. M. C. 98; 29 L. T. 90 | 128 |
| Brooker v. Wood , 5 B. & Ad. 1052; 3 N. & M. 96 | 102, 559 |
| Brooks v. Bockett , 9 Q. B. 847; 16 L. J. Q. B. 178; 11 Jur. 234 | 316 |
| — v. Cock , 3 A. & E. 138; 4 N. & M. 652; 1 H. & W. 129 | 522 |
| Broughton v. Manchester Waterworks , 3 B. & A. 1 | 496 |
| Brown, Ex parte , 3 Q. B. D. 545; 47 L. J. M. C. 108; 38 L. T. 682; 26 W. R. 757 | 415 |
| — Re , 33 L. J. Q. B. 193; 5 B. & S. 280 ¹ | 125, 507 |
| — v. Duncan , 10 B. & C. 93; 5 M. & R. 114 | 563 |
| — v. Foot , 61 L. J. M. C. 110; 66 L. T. 649; 56 J. P. 581; 17 Cox C. C. 509 | 145 |
| — v. G. E. Ry. Co. , 2 Q. B. D. 406; 46 L. J. M. C. 231; 36 L. T. 767; 25 W. R. 792 | 507 |
| — v. G. W. Ry. Co. , 9 Q. B. D. 744; 51 L. J. Q. B. 529; 47 L. T. 216; 30 W. R. 671; 46 J. P. 803 | 76, 215, 225 |
| — v. Holyhead Board , 1 H. & C. 601; 32 L. J. Ex. 25; 7 L. T. 332; 11 W. R. 71 | 417, 567 |
| — v. Howard , 2 B. & B. 73; 4 Moore 508 | 8 |
| — v. London (Mayor) , 9 C. B. N. S. 726; 30 L. J. C. P. 225; 7 Jur. N. S. 755; 3 L. T. 813; 9 W. R. 336; & 13 C. B. N. S. 828; 31 L. J. C. P. 280; 8 Jur. N. S. 1103; 10 W. R. 522 | 553 |
| — v. London and N. W. Ry. Co. , 4 B. & S. 326; 32 L. J. Q. B. 218; 10 Jur. N. S. 234; 11 W. R. 884 | 92 |
| — v. McLachlan , L. R. 4 P. C. 543; 42 L. J. P. C. 18; 21 W. R. 277; 9 Moo. P. C. C. N. S. 384 | 459 |
| — v. McMillan , 7 M. & W. 196; 8 D. P. C. 852; 4 Jur. 1090 | 251 |
| — v. Shaw , 1 Ex. D. 425 | 526, 544 |
| — v. Tombs , [1891] 1 Q. B. 253; 60 L. J. Q. B. 38; 64 L. T. 114; 55 J. P. 359; 1 Fox 196 | 105 |
| Brown's Case , 2 East P. C. 487 | 388 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------------------|
| Browne <i>v.</i> Collyer, 2 L. M. & P. 470; 20 L. J. Q. B. 426; 15 Jur. 881 | 108 |
| Browning, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 9 Ch. 583; 43 L. J. Bk. 129; 30 L. T. 481; 22 W. R. 638 | 565 |
| Bruce, <i>Re</i> , 2 Cr. & J. 436; 2 Tyr. 475 | 206 |
| Brumfit <i>v.</i> Bremner, 9 C. B. N. S. 1; K. & G. 352; 30 L. J. C. P. 33; 7 Jur. N. S. 371; 3 L. T. 375; 9 W. R. 144 | 529 |
| — <i>v.</i> Roberts, L. R. 5 C. P. 224; 39 L. J. Ch. 95; 22 L. T. 301; 18 W. R. 678; 1 Hop. & C. 387 | 129, 541 |
| Brunskill <i>v.</i> Watson, L. R. 3 Q. B. 418; 37 L. J. M. C. 103; 18 L. T. 432; 16 W. R. 1009 | 411 |
| Bruyeres <i>v.</i> Halcomb, 3 A. & E. 381 | 443 |
| Bryan <i>v.</i> Child, 5 Ex. 368; 1 L. M. & P. 429; 19 L. J. Ex. 264; 14 Jur. 510 | 60, 71, 294, 455 |
| Buccleuch (Duke of) <i>v.</i> Metrop. B. Works, L. R. 5 Ex. 221; 39 L. J. Ex. 130; 23 L. T. 255; & L. R. 5 H. L. 418; 41 L. J. Ex. 137; 27 L. T. 1 | 430 |
| Buckhurst Peerage, The, 2 App. Cas. 1 | 566 |
| Buckle <i>v.</i> Wrightson, 5 B. & S. 854; 34 L. J. M. C. 43; 11 Jur. N. S. 280; 11 L. T. 341; 13 W. R. 92 | 231 |
| Bulkeley <i>v.</i> Schutz, L. R. 3 P. C. 764; 6 Moo. P. C. C. N. S. 481 | 204 |
| Bull <i>v.</i> Chapman, 8 Ex. 444; 22 L. J. Ex. 257 | 556 |
| Bunny, <i>Ex parte</i> , 1 De G. & J. 119; 26 L. J. Bk. 83; 3 Jur. N. S. 1141 | 490 |
| Burden, <i>Re</i> , 21 Q. B. D. 24; 57 L. J. Q. B. 570; 59 L. T. 149; 36 W. R. 896; 5 M. B. R. 166 | 373 |
| — <i>v.</i> Kennedy, 3 Atk. 739 | 191 |
| Burdett, <i>Re</i> , 20 Q. B. D. 310; 57 L. J. Q. B. 263; 58 L. T. 708; 36 W. R. 345; 5 M. B. R. 32 | 296, 566 |
| Burgess <i>v.</i> Wickham, 3 B. & S. 698; 33 L. J. Q. B. 28 | 32 |
| Burgess's Case, 15 Ch. D. 507; 49 L. J. Ch. 541; 43 L. T. 45; 28 W. R. 792 | 292 |
| Burkhill <i>v.</i> Thomas, [1892] 1 Q. B. 312; 61 L. J. Q. B. 322; 66 L. T. 150; 40 W. R. 250 | 323 |
| Burling <i>v.</i> Harley, 3 H. & N. 271; 27 L. J. Ex. 258; 4 Jur. N. S. 789 | 325 |
| Burn <i>v.</i> Carvalho, 4 N. & M. 889; 1 A. & E. 883 | 595 |
| Burnby <i>v.</i> Bollett, 16 M. & W. 644; 17 L. J. Ex. 190; 11 Jur. 827 | 142 |
| Burns <i>v.</i> Nowell, 5 Q. B. D. 444; 49 L. J. Q. B. 468; 43 L. T. 342; 29 W. R. 39; 44 J. P. 828 | 301 |
| Burton <i>v.</i> Henson, 10 M. & W. 105 | 500 |
| Bury <i>v.</i> Cherrybohn, 1 Ex. D. 457; 35 L. T. 403 | 236 |
| — (Mayor of) <i>v.</i> Lancs. and Yorks. Ry., 14 App. Cas. 417; 61 L. T. 417 | 99 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xxix

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| <i>Busfield, Re</i> , 32 Ch. D. 123; 55 L. J. Ch. 467; 54 L. T. 220; 34 W. R. 372 | 413 |
| <i>Bustros v. White</i> , 1 Q. B. D. 423; 45 L. J. Q. B. 642; 34 L. T. 835; 24 W. R. 721 | 337, 434 |
| <i>Butcher v. Henderson</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 335; 37 L. J. Q. B. 139; 16 W. R. 855; 9 B. & S. 403. | 587, 590 |
| <i>Bute v. Grindall</i> , 1 T. R. 338; 2 H. Bl. 265; 1 R. R. 220 | 189 |
| <i>Buxton v. N. E. Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 549; 37 L. J. Q. B. 258; 18 L. T. 795; 16 W. R. 1124; 9 B. & S. 824 | 579 |
| <i>Buxton v. Rust</i> , L. R. 7 Ex. 1, 279; 41 L. J. Ex. 1, 173; 26 L. T. 502; 27 L. T. 210; 20 W. R. 100, 1014. | 409 |
| <i>Byerley v. Prevost</i> , L. R. 6 C. P. 144 | 161 |
| <i>Bywater, Doe d., v. Brandling</i> , 7 B. & C. 643; 1 M. & R. 600 | 64 |

C.

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>Cable v. Marks</i> , 51 L. J. Ch. 419; 47 L. T. 432; 31 W. R. 221 | 99 |
| <i>Caiston v. N. Kelsey</i> , 59 L. J. M. C. 102; 62 L. T. 731 | 284 |
| <i>Calcutta Jute Co. v. Nicholson</i> , 1 Ex. D. 428; 45 L. J. Ex. 821; 35 L. T. 275; 26 W. R. 71 | 207 |
| <i>Calder v. Bull</i> , 3 Dallas 390 | 299 |
| — <i>v. Halket</i> , 3 Moo. 28 | 279 |
| — <i>and Hebble Nav. Co. v. Pilling</i> , 14 M. & W. 76; 3 Rly. Cas. 735; 14 L. J. Ex. 223; 9 Jur. 377 | 418 |
| <i>Caldow v. Pixell</i> , 2 C. P. D. 562; 46 L. J. C. P. 541; 36 L. T. 469; 25 W. R. 773. | 521, 530 |
| <i>Caledonian Ry. Co. v. N. Brit. Ry. Co.</i> , 6 App. Cas. 122; 29 W. R. 685 | 27 |
| — <i>v. Walker's Trustees</i> , 7 App. Cas. 259; 46 L. T. 826; 30 W. R. 569; 46 J. P. 676 | 131 |
| <i>Californian Fig Syrup Co., Re</i> , 40 Ch. D. 620; 58 L. J. Ch. 341; 60 L. T. 590; 37 W. R. 268 | 208 |
| <i>Cambridge Union v. Power</i> , 10 C. B. N. S. 991; 30 L. J. M. C. 241 | 51 |
| <i>Cameron v. Cameron</i> , 2 M. & K. 289 | 38 |
| <i>Campbell, Ex parte</i> , L. R. 5 Ch. 703; 23 L. T. 289; 18 W. R. 1056 | 433 |
| — <i>v. Im Thurn</i> , 1 C. P. D. 267; 45 L. J. C. P. 482; 35 L. T. 265; 24 W. R. 675 | 120 |
| — <i>v. Maund</i> , 5 A. & E. 865; 1 N. & P. 558; 2 H. & W. 457 | 116 |
| — <i>v. Strangeways</i> , 3 C. P. D. 105; 47 L. J. M. C. 6; 37 L. T. 672 | 489 |
| <i>Candy v. Mangham</i> , 6 M. & Gr. 710; 1 D. & L. 745; 7 Scott N. R. 401; 7 Jur. 1040; 13 L. J. C. P. 17 | 191 |
| <i>Canterbury's (Abp. of) Case</i> , 2 Rep. 46 b | 482 |
| <i>Capel v. Child</i> , 2 Cr. & J. 558; 2 Tyr. 689 | 514 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| Carl Johann, The, 1 Hagg. 113 | 212 |
| Carpue v. Lond. and Bright. Ry. Co., 5 Q. B. 747; D. & M. 608; 3 Rly. Cas. 692; 13 L. J. Q. B. 133; 8 Jur. 464 | 325 |
| Carr v. Fowle, [1893] 1 Q. B. 251; 62 L. J. Q. B. 177; 68 L. T. 123; 41 W. R. 365; 57 J. P. 136 | 402 |
| — v. Royal Exch. Ass. Co., 5 B. & S. 433, 941; 10 Jur. N. S. 316; 33 L. J. Q. B. 63; 10 L. T. N. S. 265; 12 W. R. 127 | 63 |
| Carron Iron Co. v. Maclaren, 5 H. L. 759; 24 L. J. Ch. 620 | 92 |
| Carruthers, <i>Ex parte</i> , 9 East 44 | 223 |
| — v. Sydebotham, 4 M. & S. 77 | 496 |
| Carter v. Boehm, 3 Burr. 1918; 1 W. Bl. 593 | 360 |
| — v. Murcott, 4 Burr. 2163 | 138 |
| — v. Thomas, [1893] 1 Q. B. 673; 62 L. J. M. C. 104; 69 L. T. 436; 41 W. R. 510; 57 J. P. 438 | 504 |
| Case v. Story, L. R. 4 Ex. 319; 38 L. J. M. C. 115; 20 L. T. 618; 17 W. R. 802 | 461 |
| Casher v. Holmes, 2 B. & A. 592 | 483 |
| Castelli v. Groom, 18 Q. B. 490; 21 L. J. Q. B. 308; 16 Jur. 888 339, 350 | |
| Castioni, <i>Re</i> , [1891] 1 Q. B. 149; 60 L. J. M. C. 22; 64 L. T. 344; 39 W. R. 202; 55 J. P. 328; 17 Cox C. C. 225 | 29 |
| Caswell v. Worth, 5 El. & B. 849; 25 L. J. Q. B. 121; 2 Jur. N. S. 116 | 237 |
| Cates v. Knight, 3 T. R. 442 | 180, 183, 454 |
| Cathcart v. Hardy, 2 M. & S. 537; 5 Taunt. 2 | 488 |
| Catling v. King, 5 Ch. D. 660; 46 L. J. Ch. 384; 36 L. T. 526; 25 W. R. 550 | 409 |
| Cave v. Hastings, 7 Q. B. D. 125; 50 L. J. Q. B. 575; 45 L. T. 348 | 408 |
| Cesena Sulphur Co. v. Nicholson, 1 Ex. D. 428; 45 L. J. Ex. 821; 35 L. T. 275; 25 W. R. 71 | 92, 207 |
| Chadwick v. Ball, 14 Q. B. D. 855; 54 L. J. Q. B. 396; 52 L. T. 949 | 180 |
| Chamberlain v. King, L. R. 6 C. P. 474; 40 L. J. C. P. 273; 24 L. T. 736; 19 W. R. 931 | 325 |
| — v. West End and Crystal Pal. Ry. Co., 2 B. & S. 617; 32 L. J. Q. B. 173; 9 Jur. N. S. 1051; 8 L. T. 149; 11 W. R. 472 | 131 |
| Chamberlaine v. Chester Ry. Co., 1 Ex. 370; 18 L. J. Ex. 494 576, 578, 581 | |
| Chambers v. Green, L. R. 20 Eq. 552; 44 L. J. Ch. 600 | 179 |
| — v. Manchester Ry. Co., 5 B. & S. 588; 33 L. J. Q. B. 268; 10 Jur. N. S. 700 | 417, 525 |
| Champion v. Plummer, 1 N. R. 252; 5 Esp. 240; 8 R. R. 795 | 409 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xxxī

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| <i>Chance v. Adams</i> , 1 <i>Ld. Raym.</i> 77 | 57 |
| <i>Chapman v. Chapman</i> , 4 <i>Ch. D.</i> 800; 46 <i>L. J. Ch.</i> 104 | 474 |
| — <i>v. Milvain</i> , 5 <i>Ex.</i> 61; 1 <i>L. M. & P.</i> 209 | 226 |
| — <i>v. Robinson</i> , 1 <i>E. & B.</i> 25; 28 <i>L. J. M. C.</i> 30; 5 <i>Jur. N. S.</i> 434 | 268 |
| — <i>v. Shepherd</i> , <i>L. R.</i> 2 <i>C. P.</i> 228; 36 <i>L. J. C. P.</i> 113; 15 <i>L. T.</i> 477; 15 <i>W. R.</i> 314 | 153 |
| <i>Chappell v. Purday</i> , 12 <i>M. & W.</i> 303; 1 <i>D. & L.</i> 458; 13 <i>L. J. Ex.</i> 7 | 310 |
| <i>Charles v. Blackwell</i> , 2 <i>C. P. D.</i> 151; 46 <i>L. J. C. P.</i> 368; 36 <i>L. T.</i> 195; 25 <i>W. R.</i> 472 | 102 |
| <i>Charlotta, The</i> , 1 <i>Dods.</i> 387 | 147 |
| <i>Charlton v. Hay</i> , 31 <i>L. T.</i> 437; 23 <i>W. R.</i> 129 | 577 |
| <i>Charlwood v. Bedford</i> , 1 <i>Atk.</i> 497 | 409 |
| <i>Charrington v. Meatheringham</i> , 2 <i>M. & W.</i> 228 | 586 |
| <i>Charter v. Charter</i> , <i>L. R.</i> 7 <i>H. L.</i> 364; 43 <i>L. J. P. & M.</i> 73 | 32 |
| <i>Chartered Merc. Bank v. Netherland S. N. Co.</i> , 10 <i>Q. B. D.</i> 521; 52 <i>L. J. Q. B.</i> 220; 48 <i>L. T.</i> 546; 31 <i>W. R.</i> 445; 47 <i>J. P.</i> 260 | 212 |
| — <i>v. Wilson</i> , 3 <i>Ex. D.</i> 108; 47 <i>L. J. Ex.</i> 153; 38 <i>L. T.</i> 254; 26 <i>W. R.</i> 265 | 464 |
| <i>Chateaufeuf v. Capeyron</i> , 7 <i>App. Cas.</i> 127; 51 <i>L. J. P. C.</i> 37; 46 <i>L. T.</i> 65; 4 <i>Asp. M. C.</i> 489 | 524 |
| <i>Chatterton v. Cave</i> , 2 <i>C. P. D.</i> 42; 46 <i>L. J. C. P.</i> 97; 35 <i>L. T.</i> 587; 25 <i>W. R.</i> 102; & 3 <i>App. Cas.</i> 483; 47 <i>L. J. C. P.</i> 545; 38 <i>L. T.</i> 397; 26 <i>W. R.</i> 498 | 272 |
| <i>Chelsea Vestry v. King</i> , 17 <i>C. B. N. S.</i> 625; 34 <i>L. J. M. C.</i> 9; 10 <i>Jur.</i> 1150; 11 <i>L. T.</i> 419; 13 <i>W. R.</i> 157 | 378 |
| — <i>Waterworks v. Bowley</i> , 17 <i>Q. B.</i> 358; 20 <i>L. J. M. C.</i> 520 | 474 |
| <i>Cherry's Estate, Re</i> , 31 <i>L. J. Ch.</i> 351 | 18 |
| <i>Chick v. Smith</i> , 8 <i>D. P. C.</i> 337; 4 <i>Jur.</i> 86 | 489 |
| <i>Child v. Hearne</i> , <i>L. R.</i> 9 <i>Ex.</i> 176; 43 <i>L. J. Ex.</i> 100; 22 <i>W. R.</i> 864 | 484 |
| <i>Chillington Iron Co., Re</i> , 29 <i>Ch. D.</i> 159; 54 <i>L. J. Ch.</i> 624; 52 <i>L. T.</i> 504; 33 <i>W. R.</i> 442 | 117 |
| <i>Chilton v. London and Croydon R. Co.</i> , 16 <i>M. & W.</i> 212; 16 <i>L. J. Ex.</i> 89; 11 <i>Jur.</i> 149 | 418 |
| <i>China, The</i> , 7 <i>Wallace</i> 67 | 496 |
| <i>Chinery, Ex parte</i> , 12 <i>Q. B. D.</i> 342; 53 <i>L. J. Ch.</i> 662; 50 <i>L. T.</i> 342; 32 <i>W. R.</i> 469; 1 <i>M. B. R.</i> 31 | 379 |
| <i>Chinnery v. Evans</i> , 11 <i>H. L.</i> 115; 10 <i>Jur. N. S.</i> 855; 11 <i>L. T.</i> 68; 13 <i>W. R.</i> 20 | 166 |
| <i>Chisholm v. Doulton</i> , 22 <i>Q. B. D.</i> 726; 58 <i>L. J. M. C.</i> 133; 60 <i>L. T.</i> 966; 16 <i>Cox C. C.</i> 675; 37 <i>W. R.</i> 749; 53 <i>J. P.</i> 550 | 144 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Chorlton v. Lings</i> , L. R. 4 C. P. 374; 38 L. J. C. P. 25; 19 L. T. 534; 17 W. R. 284; 1 Hopw. & C. 1 | 117 |
| <i>Christ's Hospital v. Hawes</i> , Duke on Charit. Uses, p. 84 | 118 |
| <i>Christopherson v. Lotings</i> , 15 C. B. N. S. 809; 33 L. J. C. P. 121; 10 Jur. N. S. 180; 9 L. T. 688; 12 W. R. 410. | 17, 107, 354 |
| <i>Church v. Hubbard</i> , 2 Cranch 87. | 208 |
| <i>Churchill v. Crease</i> , 5 Bing. 180; 2 M. & P. 415 | 232, 311, 585 |
| <i>Cigala's Settlement, Re</i> , 7 Ch. D. 351; 47 L. J. Ch. 166; 38 L. T. 439 | 207 |
| <i>City & S. London Ry. v. London C. C.</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 513; 60 L. J. M. C. 149; 65 L. T. 362; 40 W. R. 166; 56 J. P. 6 | 218 |
| <i>Clack v. Sainsbury</i> , 11 C. B. 695; 2 L. M. & P. 627 | 233, 234 |
| <i>Clan Gordon, The</i> , 7 P. D. 190; 4 Asp. M. C. 513; 46 L. T. 490; 30 W. R. 691 | 496 |
| <i>Clapham v. Langton</i> , 5 B. & S. 729; 34 L. J. Q. B. 46; 10 L. T. 875; 12 W. R. 1011 | 32 |
| <i>Clarence R. Co. v. G. N. of England R. Co.</i> , 13 M. & W. 706; 3 Rly. Cas. 426; 7 Jur. 65; 3 G. & D. 389; 4 Q. B. 46; 12 L. J. Q. B. 145 | 502 |
| <i>Clark, Re</i> , [1894] 2 Q. B. 393; 63 L. J. Q. B. 806; 70 L. T. 751; 1 Manson 207 | 271 |
| — <i>v. Denton</i> , 1 B. & A. 92 | 567 |
| — <i>v. Gaskarth</i> , 8 Taunt. 431; 2 Moore 491 | 471 |
| — <i>v. R.</i> , 14 Q. B. D. 92; 54 L. J. M. C. 66; 52 L. T. 136; 33 W. R. 226; 49 J. P. 246 | 377 |
| — <i>v. Wallond</i> , 52 L. J. Q. B. 321; 48 L. T. 762; 31 W. R. 551; 47 J. P. 551 | 433 |
| <i>Clarke v. Bradlaugh</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 63; 51 L. J. Q. B. 1; 46 L. T. 49; 30 W. R. 53; 46 J. P. 278 | 489 |
| — <i>v. Bury St. Edmunds</i> , 1 C. B. N. S. 23; 26 L. J. C. P. 12. | 93 |
| — <i>v. Crowder</i> , L. R. 4 C. P. 638; 38 L. J. M. C. 118; 17 W. R. 857 | 331 |
| — <i>v. Gaut</i> , 8 Ex. 252; 22 L. J. Ex. 67; 17 Jur. 239 | 217, 529 |
| — <i>v. Molyneux</i> , 3 Q. B. D. 237; 47 L. J. Q. B. 230; 37 L. T. 694; 26 W. R. 104; 14 Cox C. C. 10 | 326 |
| — <i>v. Powell</i> , 4 B. & Ad. 846; 1 N. & M. 492 | 49 |
| — <i>v. Roche</i> , 3 Q. B. D. 170; 47 L. J. Q. B. 147; 37 L. T. 633; 26 W. R. 112 | 171, 273 |
| <i>Clay v. Ray</i> , 17 C. B. N. S. 188 | 559 |
| <i>Claydon v. Green</i> , L. R. 3 C. P. 511; 37 L. J. C. P. 226; 18 L. T. 607; 16 W. R. 1126 | 57, 59 |
| <i>Clays v. Sudgrave</i> , 1 Salk. 33 | 426 |
| <i>Clayton's Case</i> , 5 Rep. 1 b | 489 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xxxiii

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Clementson v. Mason, L. R. 10 C. P. 217; 44 L. J. C. P. 171; 32 L. T. 325; 23 W. R. 620 | 16, 44 |
| Clerkenwell Vestry v. Feary, 24 Q. B. D. 703; 59 L. J. M. C. 82; 62 L. T. 697; 54 J. P. 676 | 513 |
| Clifford v. Watts, L. R. 5 C. P. 577; 40 L. J. C. P. 36; 22 L. T. 717; 18 W. R. 925 | 541 |
| Clift v. Schwabe, 3 C. B. 437; 17 L. J. C. P. 2; 2 C. & K. 134 | 424 |
| Climpson v. Coles, 23 Q. B. D. 465; 58 L. J. Q. B. 346; 61 L. T. 116; 38 W. R. 110 | 132 |
| Cliquot's Champagne, 3 Wallace 145 | 406 |
| Clothier v. Webster, 12 C. B. N. S. 750; 31 L. J. C. P. 216; 10 W. R. 624 | 131, 505 |
| Clow v. Harper, 3 Ex. D. 198; 47 L. J. Ex. 393; 38 L. T. 269; 26 W. R. 364 | 429 |
| Clowes v. Staffordshire Potteries, L. R. 8 Ch. 125; 42 L. J. Ch. 107; 27 L. T. 521; 21 W. R. 32 | 420, 421 |
| Clyde Navigation v. Laird, 8 App. Cas. 658 | 100, 429 |
| Coalheaver's Case, 1 Leach 66 | 494 |
| Cobb, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 8 Ch. 727; 42 L. J. Bkcy. 63; 29 L. T. 123; 21 W. R. 777 | 172 |
| — v. Mid-Wales R. Co., L. R. 1 Q. B. 342; 35 L. J. Q. B. 117; 12 Jur. N. S. 228; 14 W. R. 775 | 406 |
| Cochran's Estate, <i>Re</i> , L. R. 5 Eq. 209; 37 L. J. Ch. 293; 17 L. T. 487; 16 W. R. 324 | 307 |
| Cochrane v. Entwistle, 25 Q. B. D. 116; 59 L. J. Q. B. 418; 62 L. T. 852; 38 W. R. 587 | 566 |
| — v. Matthews, 10 Ch. D. 80 n. | 161 |
| Cockerell v. Dickens, 3 Moo. P. C. 133 | 205 |
| Cocking v. Ward, 1 C. B. 858; 15 L. J. C. P. 246 | 361 |
| Coe v. Lawrence, 1 El. & Bl. 516; 17 Jur. 1115; 22 L. J. Q. B. 140 | 6, 384 |
| Coggins v. Bennett, 2 C. P. D. 568 | 490 |
| Cohen, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 7 Ch. 20; 41 L. J. Bkcy. 17; 25 L. T. 473; 20 W. R. 69 | 170 |
| — v. Kittell, 22 Q. B. D. 680; 58 L. J. Q. B. 241; 60 L. T. 932; 37 W. R. 400; 53 J. P. 469 | 557 |
| — v. Mitchell, 25 Q. B. D. 262; 59 L. J. Q. B. 409; 63 L. T. 206; 38 W. R. 588; 54 J. P. 804 | 271 |
| Colbron v. Traverse, 12 C. B. N. S. 181; 31 L. J. C. P. 257; 6 L. T. 287; 10 W. R. 603; 8 Jur. N. S. 1105 | 169 |
| Colchester v. Brooke, 7 Q. B. 339; 15 L. J. Q. B. 59; 9 Jur. 1090 | 582 |

c

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| <i>Colchester v. Kewnoy</i> , L. R. 10 Ex. 253; 36 L. J. Ex. 172; 12 Jur.N. S. 743; 16 L. T. 463 | 77, 189 |
| <i>Cole v. Coulton</i> , 2 El. & Bl. 695; 29 L. J. M. C. 125; 6 Jur.N. S. 698 | 258 |
| — <i>v. Green</i> , 6 M. & G. 872; 7 Scott New Rep. 682; 13 L. J. C. P. 30 | 535, 539 |
| — <i>v. N. W. Bank</i> , L. R. 10 C. P. 354; 44 L. J. C. P. 233; 32 L. T. 733 | 123 |
| <i>Colebrooke v. Layton</i> , 4 B. & Ad. 578; 1 N. & M. 374 | 169 |
| <i>Coleman v. Birmingham</i> , 6 Q. B. D. 615; 50 L. J. Q. B. 92; 44 L. T. 578; 29 W. R. 715; 45 J. P. 521 | 116 |
| <i>Collier v. Worth</i> , 1 Ex. D. 464; 35 L. T. 345 | 382 |
| <i>Collins v. Blantern</i> , 2 Wils. 341; 1 Sm. L. C. 398 | 158 |
| — <i>v. Gwynne</i> , 9 Bing. 544; 2 M. & Scott 640 | 565 |
| — <i>v. Middle Level Commrs.</i> , L. R. 4 C. P. 279; 38 L. J. C. P. 236; 20 L. T. 442; 17 W. R. 929 | 505 |
| — <i>v. Rose</i> , 5 M. & W. 194; 7 D. P. C. 796 | 490 |
| <i>Collinson v. Newcastle R. Co.</i> , 1 C. & K. 546 | 575 |
| <i>Colman v. Upcot</i> , 5 Vin. Abr. 527, pl. 17 | 408 |
| <i>Colonial Bank v. Whinney</i> , 30 Ch. D. 261; 11 App. Cas. 426; 56 L. J. Ch. 43; 55 L. T. 362; 34 W. R. 705; 3 M. B. R. 207 | 433 |
| — <i>v. Willans</i> , L. R. 5 P. C. 417 | 180 |
| <i>Colquhoun v. Brooks</i> , 14 App. Cas. 493; 49 L. J. Q. B. 53; 61 L. T. 518 | 207 |
| — <i>v. Heddon</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 129; 59 L. J. Q. B. 465; 62 L. T. 853; 38 W. R. 545 | 204 |
| <i>Coltman, In re</i> , 19 Ch. D. 64; 51 L. J. Ch. 3; 45 L. T. 392; 30 W. R. 342 | 525 |
| <i>Colvill v. Wood</i> , 2 C. B. N. S. 210; 1 Lut. Reg. Cas. 483; 15 L. J. C. P. 160; 10 Jur. 336 | 54 |
| <i>Colvin v. Buckle</i> , 8 M. & W. 680 | 8 |
| <i>Colyer, Re</i> , 50 L. J. Ch. 79; 43 L. T. 454 | 416 |
| <i>Combe v. Pitt</i> , 3 Burr. 1434 | 489 |
| <i>Commins v. Scott</i> , L. R. 20 Eq. 11; 44 L. J. Ch. 563; 32 L. T. 420; 23 W. R. 498 | 408 |
| <i>Cone v. Bowles</i> , 1 Salk. 205 | 406 |
| <i>Connan, Re</i> , 20 Q. B. D. 690; 57 L. J. Q. B. 472; 59 L. T. 281; 5 M. B. R. 89 | 551 |
| <i>Conservators of Thames v. Hall</i> , L. R. 3 C. P. 415; 37 L. J. C. P. 163; 18 L. T. 361; 16 W. R. 971 | 240, 243 |
| <i>Conservators of River Tone v. Ash</i> , 10 B. & C. 349 | 494 |
| <i>Constantine v. Constantine</i> , 6 Ves. 100 | 215 |
| <i>Constitution, The</i> , 4 P. D. 39; 48 L. J. Adm. 13; 40 L. T. 219; 27 W. R. 739 | 201 |

TABLE OF CASES.

XXXV

| | PAGE |
|--|--------------|
| <i>Conybeare v. L. School Bd.</i> , [1891] 1 Q. B. 118; 60 L. J. Q. B. 44; 63 L. T. 651; 39 W. R. 288; 55 J. P. 151; 17 Cox C. C. 191 | 199 |
| <i>Cook v. Loveland</i> , 2 Bos. & P. 31; 5 R. R. 533 | 517 |
| — <i>v. N. Metropolitan Tramways Co.</i> , 18 Q. B. D. 683; 56 L. J. Q. B. 309; 56 L. T. 448; 57 L. T. 476; 35 W. R. 577; 51 J. P. 630 | 470 |
| — <i>v. Ward</i> , 2 C. P. D. 255; 36 L. T. 893; 25 W. R. 593 | 517 |
| <i>Cookney v. Anderson</i> , 1 De G. J. & Sm. 365 | 413 |
| <i>Coomber v. Berks Justices</i> , 9 Q. B. D. 26; 10 Id. 267; 9 App. Cas. 61; 53 L. J. Q. B. 239; 47 L. T. 687; 47 J. P. 164; 31 W. R. 356 | 58, 188 |
| <i>Cooper v. Habbuck</i> , 12 C. B. N. S. 456; 31 L. J. C. P. 323 | 11 |
| — <i>v. Prichard</i> , 11 Q. B. D. 351; 52 L. J. Q. B. 526; 48 L. T. 848; 31 W. R. 834 | 24 |
| — <i>v. Simmons</i> , 7 H. & N. 707; 31 L. J. M. C. 138; 8 Jur. V. S. 81; 5 L. T. 712; 10 W. R. 270 | 147 |
| — <i>v. Wandsworth Board</i> , 14 C. B. N. S. 180; 32 L. J. C. P. 185; 9 Jur. N. S. 1155; 11 W. R. 646 | 513 |
| — <i>v. Whittingham</i> , 15 Ch. D. 501; 49 L. J. Ch. 752; 43 L. T. 16; 28 W. R. 720 | 570 |
| — <i>v. Woolley</i> , L. R. 2 Ex. 88; 36 L. J. M. C. 27; 15 L. T. 539; 15 W. R. 450 | 285 |
| <i>Cope v. Barber</i> , L. R. 7 C. P. 393; 41 L. J. M. C. 137; 26 L. T. 891; 20 W. R. 885 | 482 |
| — <i>v. Doherty</i> , 4 K. & J. 367; 27 L. J. 600; 4 Jur. N. S. 541 45, 196, 210, 212, 434 | 561 |
| — <i>v. Rowlands</i> , 2 M. & W. 149; 2 Gale 231 | 561 |
| — <i>v. Thames Haven R. Co.</i> , 3 Ex. 841; 6 Rly. Cas. 83; 18 L. J. Ex. 345 | 525 |
| <i>Copeland, Ex parte</i> , 2 De G. M. & G. 914; 22 L. J. Bkcy. 17; 17 Jur. 121 | 50, 392, 457 |
| <i>Copeman v. Gallant</i> , 1 P. Wms. 320 | 64, 70 |
| <i>Copland v. Davies</i> , L. R. 5 H. L. 358; 21 W. R. 1 | 63 |
| — <i>v. Powell</i> , 1 Bing. 373 | 482 |
| <i>Copley v. Burton (Brown)</i> , L. R. 5 C. P. 489; 39 L. J. M. C. 141; 22 L. T. 888 | 140 |
| <i>Corbet's Case</i> , 1 Rep. 88 | 355 |
| <i>Corbet v. Haigh</i> , 5 C. P. D. 50; 42 L. T. 185; 28 W. R. 430; 44 J. P. 39 | 272 |
| <i>Corbett, Ex parte</i> , 14 Ch. D. 122; 49 L. J. Bkcy. 74; 42 L. T. 164; 28 W. R. 569 | 278 |
| <i>Core v. James</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 135; 41 L. J. M. C. 19; 25 L. T. 593; 20 W. R. 201 | 43, 104, 140 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------------------------------|
| <i>Cork and Bandon Ry. Co. v. Goode</i> , 13 C. B. 827; 22 L. J. C. P. 198; 17 Jur. 555 | 468 |
| <i>Cork and Youghal Ry Co., Re</i> , L. R. 4 Ch. 748; 39 L. J. Ch. 277; 21 L. T. 735 | 525, 555 |
| <i>Cornell v. Hay</i> , L. R. 8 C. P. 328; 42 L. J. C. P. 136; 28 L. T. 475; 21 W. R. 580. | 154 |
| <i>Cornill v. Hudson</i> , 8 E. & B. 429; 27 L. J. Q. B. 8; 3 Jur. N. S. 1257 | 313, 452 |
| <i>Cornish v. Hocking</i> , 1 E. & B. 602; 22 L. J. Q. B. 142; 17 Jur. 1049 | 314 |
| <i>Cornwall Mining Co. v. Bennett</i> , 5 H. & N. 432; 29 L. J. Ex. 157; 6 Jur. N. S. 539 | 525 |
| <i>Corporation of Newcastle v. The Attorney-General</i> , 12 Cl. & F. 402. | 118 |
| <i>Cortis v. Kent Waterworks</i> , 7 B. & C. 314 | 108, 225 |
| <i>Costa Rica v. Erlanger</i> , 3 Ch. D. 62; 45 L. J. Ch. 743; 35 L. T. 19; 24 W. R. 955 | 314 |
| <i>Cottier v. Merrick</i> , Hard 94. | 216 |
| <i>Cotton v. James, Moo. & Mal.</i> 273; 3 C. & P. 505 | 463 |
| <i>Couch v. Steel</i> , 3 E. & B. 402; 2 C. L. R. 940; 23 L. J. Q. B. 121; 18 Jur. 515 | 571, 575, 577, 578, 579, 584 |
| <i>Coulbert v. Troke</i> , 1 Q. B. D. 1; 45 L. J. M. C. 7; 33 L. T. 340; 24 W. R. 41 | 491 |
| <i>Courtauld v. Legh</i> , L. R. 4 Ex. 126; 38 L. J. Ex. 45; 19 L. T. 737; 17 W. R. 466. | 445 |
| <i>Courteen's Case</i> , Hob. 270; 1 Hale P. C. 542 | 85 |
| <i>Coverdale v. Charlton</i> , 4 Q. B. D. 104; 48 L. J. Q. B. 128; 40 L. T. 88; 27 W. R. 257 | 129, 435 |
| <i>Cowen, Ex parte</i> , L. R. 2 Ch. 563; 16 L. T. 469; 15 W. R. 859 | 172 |
| <i>Cowley v. Byas</i> , 5 Ch. D. 944; 37 L. T. 238; 26 W. R. 1 | 226 |
| — <i>v. Newmarket Loc. Bd.</i> , [1892] A. C. 345; 67 L. T. 486; 56 J. P. 805 | 584 |
| <i>Cox v. Cannon</i> , 4 Bing. N. C. 453 | 551 |
| — <i>v. Hakes</i> , 15 App. Cas. 506; 60 L. J. Q. B. 89; 63 L. T. 392; 39 W. R. 145; 54 J. P. 820 | 36, 126, 353 |
| — <i>v. Leigh</i> , L. R. 9 Q. B. 333; 43 L. J. Q. B. 123; 30 L. T. 494; 22 W. R. 730. | 429 |
| — <i>v. Rabbits</i> , 3 App. Cas. 473; 47 L. J. Q. B. 385; 38 L. T. 430; 26 W. R. 483. | 403 |
| <i>Cox's Trusts, Re</i> , 9 Ch. D. 159; 47 L. J. Ch. 735; 27 W. R. 53. | 475 |
| <i>Coxhead v. Mullis</i> , 3 C. P. D. 439; 47 L. J. C. P. 761; 39 L. T. 349; 27 W. R. 136. | 7 |
| <i>Cracknell v. Thetford</i> , L. R. 4 C. P. 629; 38 L. J. C. P. 353 | 503 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xxxvii

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Craft v. Boite , 1 Saund. 247 | 364 |
| Craig's Claim, Re , [1895] 1 Ch. 267; 63 L. J. Ch. 859; 71 L. T. 705; 43 W. R. 244 | 79 |
| Crake v. Powell , 2 E. & B. 210; 21 L. J. Q. B. 183 | 337 |
| Crane v. Lawrence , 25 Q. B. D. 152; 59 L. J. M. C. 110; 63 L. T. 197; 38 W. R. 602; 54 J. P. 471 | 377 |
| — <i>v. Powell</i> , L. R. 4 C. P. 123; 38 L. J. C. P. 43; 20 L. T. 703; 17 W. R. 161 | 408 |
| Craven v. Smith , L. R. 4 Ex. 146; 38 L. J. Ex. 90; 20 L. T. 400; 17 W. R. 710 | 152 |
| Crawford v. Spooner , 6 Moo. 9 | 4 |
| Crawley v. Phillips , Sid. 222 | 120 |
| Crawshaw v. Harrison , [1894] 1 Q. B. 79; 63 L. J. Q. B. 94; 69 L. T. 860; 1 Manson 407 | 294 |
| Credits Gerundouse v. Van Weede , 12 Q. B. D. 171; 53 L. J. Q. B. 142; 32 W. R. 414; 48 J. P. 184 | 207 |
| Crespigny v. Wittenoom , 4 T. R. 793 | 63, 468 |
| Crisp v. Bunbury , 8 Bing. 374; 1 M. & Scott 646 | 181 |
| — <i>v. Martin</i> , 2 P. D. 15 | 125 |
| Crispin, Ex parte , L. R. 8 Ch. 374; 42 L. J. Bkcy. 65; 28 L. T. 483; 21 W. R. 491 | 204 |
| Crocker v. Knight , [1892] 1 Q. B. 702; 61 L. J. Q. B. 466; 66 L. T. 596; 40 W. R. 353; 56 J. P. 420 | 230 |
| Croft v. Lumley , 6 H. L. 672; 27 L. J. Q. B. 321 | 163 |
| Crofts v. Haldane , L. R. 2 Q. B. 194; 16 L. T. 116; 8 B. & S. 194 | 133 |
| Crook v. De Vandes , 9 Ves. 197; 11 Ves. 330 | 447 |
| Crooke's Case , Shaw 208 | 187 |
| Cross v. Watts , 32 L. J. C. P. 73; 13 C. B. N. S. 239; 9 Jur. N. S. 776; 7 L. T. 463; 11 W. R. 210 | 167 |
| Croydon Union v. Reigate Union , 14 App. Cas. 465; 59 L. J. M. C. 29; 53 J. P. 580 | 96 |
| Crumbie v. Wallsend Loc. Bd. , [1891] 1 Q. B. 503; 60 L. J. Q. B. 392; 64 L. T. 490; 55 J. P. 421 | 490 |
| Cuckfield Board, Re , 19 Beav. 153; 24 L. J. Ch. 585 | 187, 248, 252 |
| Cull v. Austin , L. R. 7 C. P. 234; 41 L. J. C. P. 153; 26 L. T. 767; 20 W. R. 863; 1 Hop. & C. 741 | 3, 48 |
| Cullen v. Trimble , L. R. 7 Q. B. 416; 41 L. J. M. C. 132; 26 L. T. 691; 20 W. R. 691 | 185, 501 |
| Cullerne v. London Bldg. Socy. , 25 Q. B. D. 485; 59 L. J. Q. B. 525; 39 W. R. 88; 63 L. T. 511 | 443 |
| Culverson v. Melton , 12 A. & E. 753; 2 M. & Rob. 200; 4 P. & D. 445; 4 Jur. 1130 | 16 |

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Cumberland v. Copeland, 1 H. & C. 194; 31 L. J. Ex. 353; 9 Jur. N. S. 253; 7 L. T. 334 | 223, 240 |
| Cuming v. Toms, or Jones, 7 M. & Gr. 29, 288; 8 Scott N. R. 827; 1 Lut. Reg. Cas. 151; 8 Jur. 1052; 14 L. J. C. P. 54 | 103 |
| Cumming v. Bedborough, 15 M. & W. 438 | 570 |
| Cunard v. Hyde, E. B. & E. 670; 27 L. J. Q. B. 408; 5 Jur. N. S. 40 | 558 |
| — v. —, 2 E. & E. 1; 29 L. J. Q. B. 6; 6 Jur. N. S. 14 | 558 |
| Cundell v. Dawson, 4 C. B. 376; 17 L. J. C. P. 311 | 560 |
| Cundy v. Le Cocq, 13 Q. B. D. 210; 52 L. J. M. C. 125; 51 L. T. 265; 32 W. R. 769; 48 J. P. 599 | 138, 143 |
| Curlewis v. Mornington, 7 E. & B. 283; 26 L. J. Q. B. 181; 3 Jur. N. S. 660; & 27 L. J. Q. B. 269; 4 Jur. N. S. 535 | 360, 423 |
| Curry v. Edensor, 3 T. R. 524 | 405 |
| Curtis v. Embery, L. R. 7 Ex. 369; 42 L. J. M. C. 39; 21 W. R. 143 | 454 |
| — v. Mundy, [1892] 2 Q. B. 178; 40 W. R. 317 | 126 |
| — v. Stovin, 22 Q. B. D. 513; 58 L. J. Q. B. 174; 60 L. T. 772; 37 W. R. 315 | 323, 329 |
| Cusack v. L. & N. W. Ry., [1891] 1 Q. B. 347; 60 L. J. Q. B. 208; 64 L. T. 45; 39 W. R. 244; 55 J. P. 341 | 543 |
| Cushing v. Dupuy, 5 App. Cas. 409; 49 L. J. P. C. 63; 42 L. T. 445 | 192 |
| Custodes v. Jinks, Styles 283 | 116 |
| Cybele, The, 3 P. D. 8; 47 L. J. Adm. 86; 37 L. T. 773; 26 W. R. 345 | 86 |
| Czech v. Gen. St. Nav. Co., L. R. 3 C. P. 14; 37 L. J. C. P. 3; 17 L. T. 246; 16 W. R. 130 | 286 |

D.

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Daglish, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 8 Ch. 1072; 42 L. J. Bkcy. 102; 29 L. T. 168; 21 W. R. 893 | 132 |
| Dakins v. Seamen, 9 M. & W. 777; 6 Jur. 783 | 238 |
| Dale's Case, 6 Q. B. D. 376; 7 App. Cas. 240; 50 L. J. Q. B. 234; 43 L. T. 786; 45 J. P. 284 | 249, 433, 518, 527 |
| D'Almaine v. Boosey, 1 Yo. & C. 301 | 272 |
| Damodhar v. Deoram, 1 App. Cas. 332 | 412 |
| Daniel v. Janes, 2 C. P. D. 351 | 127, 147 |
| Dannebrog, The, L. R. 4 Adm. 386; 44 L. J. Adm. 21; 31 L. T. 759; 23 W. R. 419 | 466 |
| D'Arcy v. Tamar Ry. Co., L. R. 2 Ex. 158; 36 L. J. Ex. 37; 4 H. & C. 463 | 517 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xxxix

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Dargan v. Davies , 2 Q. B. D. 118; 46 L. J. M. C. 122; 35 L. T. 810; 25 W. R. 230 | 281 |
| Darlaston Loc. Bd. v. L. & N. W. Ry. , [1894] 2 Q. B. 694; 63 L. J. Q. B. 826; 71 L. T. 461; 43 W. R. 29; 8 Rly. & Canal Cas. 216 | 344 |
| Darley Main Colliery Co. v. Mitchell , 11 App. Cas. 127; 55 L. J. Q. B. 529; 54 L. T. 882; 51 J. P. 148; 32 W. R. 947 | 490 |
| Darlington Waggon Co. v. Harding , [1891] 1 Q. B. 245; 60 L. J. Q. B. 110; 64 L. T. 409; 39 W. R. 167 | 152 |
| Dart, The , [1893] P. 33; 62 L. J. P. 32; 69 L. T. 251; 41 W. R. 153 | 224 |
| Darvill v. Terry , 6 H. & N. 807; 30 L. J. Ex. 355 | 293 |
| Dash v. Van Kleeck , 7 Johnson 502 | 299, 314 |
| Davenish, Doe d., v. Moffatt , 15 Q. B. 257; 19 L. J. Q. B. 438; 14 Jur. 935 | 26 |
| Davenport v. R. , 3 App. Cas. 115; 47 L. J. P. C. 8; 37 L. T. 727 | 292, 515 |
| Davidson v. Burnand , L. R. 4 C. P. 117; 38 L. J. C. P. 73; 19 L. T. 782; 17 W. R. 121 | 464 |
| Davies v. Berwick , 3 E. & E. 549; 30 L. J. M. C. 84; 7 Jur. N. S. 410; 3 L. T. 697; 9 W. R. 334 | 470 |
| — v. Fitton , 2 Dr. & War. 225 | 169 |
| — v. Griffiths , 4 M. & W. 377; 7 D. P. C. 204 | 242 |
| — v. Harvey , L. R. 9 Q. B. 433; 43 L. J. M. C. 121; 30 L. T. 629; 22 W. R. 733 | 262, 394 |
| — v. Mackuna , 29 Ch. D. 596; 54 L. J. Ch. 1148; 53 L. T. 314; 33 W. R. 668; 50 J. P. 5 | 555 |
| — v. Rees , 17 Q. B. D. 408; 55 L. J. Q. B. 363; 54 L. T. 813; 34 W. R. 573 | 296 |
| Davis, Ex parte , L. R. 7 Ch. 526; 41 L. J. Bkcy. 69; 27 L. T. 53; 20 W. R. 791 | 417 |
| — v. Bryant , 6 B. & C. 651 | 295 |
| — v. Comitti , 54 L. J. Ch. 419; 52 L. T. 539 | 99 |
| — v. Curling , 8 Q. B. 286; 15 L. J. Q. B. 56; 10 Jur. 69 | 101 |
| — v. Garland , 1 Q. B. D. 250; 45 L. J. Q. B. 137; 33 L. T. 727; 24 W. R. 252 | 19 |
| — v. Hardacre , 2 Camp. 375 | 159 |
| — v. Marlborough , 1 Swan. 74 | 18 |
| — v. Park , L. R. 8 Ch. 862 n.; 42 L. J. Ch. 673; 28 L. T. 295; 21 W. R. 301 | 204 |
| — v. Stephenson , 24 Q. B. D. 529; 59 L. J. M. C. 73; 38 W. R. 492; 54 J. P. 56; 17 Cox C. C. 73 | 166 |
| — v. Strathmore , 16 Ves. 419 | 361 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Davison v. Farmer</i> , 6 Ex. 252 ; 20 L. J. Ex. 177 | 226 |
| <i>Davys v. Douglas</i> , 4 H. & N. 180 ; 28 L. J. M. C. 193 | 461 |
| <i>Daw v. L.C.C.</i> , 59 L. J. M. C. 112 ; 62 L. T. 937 ; 54 J. P. 302 | 333 |
| — <i>v. Metrop. Board</i> , 31 L. J. C. P. 223 ; 12 C. B. N. S. 164 | 225, 250, 254 |
| <i>Dawes v. Painter</i> , Freem. K. B. 175 | 369, 380 |
| — <i>v. Thomas</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 414 ; 61 L. J. Q. B. 482 ; 66 L. T. 451 ; 40 W. R. 305 ; 56 J. P. 326 | 499 |
| <i>Dawson, Ex parte</i> , L. R. 19 Eq. 433 ; 44 L. J. Bkcy. 49 ; 32 L. T. 101 ; 23 W. R. 354 | 303, 307, 316 |
| — <i>v. Fitzgerald</i> , 1 Ex. D. 257 ; 45 L. J. Ex. 893 ; 35 L. T. 220 ; 24 W. R. 773 | 178 |
| — <i>v. Midland Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 8 Ex. 8 ; 42 L. J. Ex. 49 ; 21 W. R. 56 | 98 |
| <i>Day v. Brownrigg</i> , 10 Ch. D. 294 ; 48 L. J. Ch. 173 ; 39 L. T. 553 ; 27 W. R. 217 | 114 |
| — <i>v. Savage</i> , Hob. 87 | 208, 364 |
| — <i>v. Simpson</i> , 18 C. B. N. S. 680 ; 34 L. J. M. C. 149 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 487 ; 12 L. T. 386 ; 13 W. R. 748 | 160, 474 |
| <i>Deal v. Schofield</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 8 ; 37 L. J. M. C. 15 ; 17 L. T. 143 ; 16 W. R. 77 ; 8 B. & S. 760 | 167 |
| <i>Dean of York's Case</i> , 2 Q. B. 1 | 38 |
| <i>Dean v. Bennett</i> , L. R. 6 Ch. 489 ; 40 L. J. Ch. 452 ; 24 L. T. 169 ; 19 W. R. 363 | 418 |
| — <i>v. Green</i> , 8 P. D. 89 | 217 |
| — <i>v. Mellard</i> , 15 C. B. N. S. 19 ; 32 L. J. C. P. 282 ; 10 Jur. N. S. 346 ; 11 W. R. 913 | 588 |
| <i>Dearden v. Townsend</i> , L. R. 1 Q. B. 10 ; 35 L. J. M. C. 50 ; 12 Jur. N. S. 120 ; 13 L. T. 323 ; 14 W. R. 52 | 417 |
| <i>De Beauvoir v. Welch</i> , 7 B. & C. 266 ; 1 M. & R. 81 | 346 |
| <i>De Begnis v. Armistead</i> , 10 Bing. 107 ; 3 M. & Scott 511 | 557 |
| <i>De Bode v. R.</i> , 13 Q. B. 364 ; 14 Jur. 970 | 193 |
| <i>Deck v. Deck</i> , 29 L. J. P. M. & A. 129 ; 2 Sw. & Tr. 90 ; 8 W. R. 666 ; 2 L. T. 542 | 198 |
| <i>Deere, Re</i> , L. R. 10 Ch. 658 ; 44 L. J. Bkcy. 120 ; 33 L. T. 115 ; 23 W. R. 866 | 233 |
| <i>De la Vega v. Vianna</i> , 1 B. & A. 284 | 213 |
| <i>De Londo's Case</i> , 2 East P. C. 1098 | 467 |
| <i>Denn v. Diamond</i> , 4 B. & C. 243 | 401 |
| — <i>v. Reid</i> , 10 Peters 524 | |
| <i>Dennis v. Tovell</i> , L. R. 8 Q. B. 10 ; 42 L. J. M. C. 33 ; 27 L. T. 482 ; 21 W. R. 170 | 133 |
| <i>Denny v. Thwaites</i> , 2 Ex. D. 21 ; 46 L. J. M. C. 141 ; 35 L. T. 628 | 325 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xli

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| <i>Dent v. Alcroft</i> , 30 Beav. 335 | 167 |
| — <i>v. Clayton</i> , 33 L. J. Ch. 503; 10 Jur. 671; 10 L. T. 865; 12 W. R. 903 | 351 |
| <i>D'Epineuil, Re</i> , 20 C. D. 217; 51 L. J. Ch. 491; 46 L. T. 409; 30 W. R. 423 | 132 |
| <i>Derby v. Bury Commissioners</i> , L. R. 4 Ex. 222; 38 L. J. Ex. 100; 20 L. T. 927; 17 W. R. 772 | 240 |
| <i>De Rosaz, In the Goods of</i> , 2 P. D. 66; 46 L. J. P. D. & A. 6; 36 L. T. 263; 25 W. R. 352 | 31 |
| <i>Devonshire, Duke of, v. Barrow Steel Co.</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 286; 46 L. J. Q. B. 435; 36 L. T. 355; 25 W. R. 469 | 552 |
| — <i>v. O'Connor</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 468; 59 L. J. Q. B. 206; 62 L. T. 917; 38 W. R. 420; 54 J. P. 740 | 400, 436 |
| <i>Dewhurst v. Fielden</i> , 7 M. & Gr. 187; 8 Scott N. R. 1013; 1 Lut. Reg. Cas. 274; 14 L. J. C. P. 126; 9 Jur. 376 | 53, 459 |
| <i>De Winton v. Brecon</i> , 28 L. J. Ch. 600 | 232 |
| <i>Dews v. Riley</i> , 11 C. B. 434; 20 L. J. C. P. 264; 15 Jur. 1159 | 444 |
| <i>Diana, The</i> , 4 Moo. P. C. C. 11 | 412 |
| <i>Dick, Re</i> , [1891] 1 Ch. 426; 60 L. J. Ch. 768; 64 L. T. 32; 39 W. R. 225 | 95 |
| — <i>v. Badart</i> , 10 Q. B. D. 387; 5 Asp. M. C. 49; 48 L. T. 391; 47 J. P. 422 | 417 |
| <i>Dickenson v. Fletcher</i> , L. R. 9 C. P. 1; 43 L. J. M. C. 25; 29 L. T. 540 | 140 |
| <i>Dickinson, Re</i> , 51 L. J. Ch. 736; 20 Ch. D. 315; 47 L. T. 266; 30 W. R. 667 | 519 |
| — <i>v. N. E. Ry. Co.</i> , 2 H. & C. 735; 33 L. J. Ex. 91 | 82 |
| <i>Dickson v. G. N. R.</i> , 18 Q. B. D. 176; 56 L. J. Q. B. 111; 55 L. T. 868; 35 W. R. 202; 51 J. P. 388 | 417 |
| — <i>v. Neath Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 4 Ex. 87; 38 L. J. Ex. 57; 19 L. T. 402; 17 W. R. 501 | 17 |
| <i>Diggle v. London and Blackwall Ry. Co.</i> , 5 Ex. 442; 6 Rly. Cas. 590; 19 L. J. Ex. 308; 14 Jur. 937 | 525 |
| <i>Dimmock v. Allenby</i> , 2 Marsh 582 | 451 |
| <i>Dingley v. Moor</i> , Cro. Eliz. 750 | 590 |
| <i>Direct U. S. Cable Co. v. Anglo-Amer. Tel. Co.</i> , 2 App. Cas. 394; 46 L. J. P. C. 71; 36 L. T. 265 | 27, 411 |
| <i>Diss v. Aldrich</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 179; 46 L. J. M. C. 183; 36 L. T. 663 | 412 |
| <i>Ditcher v. Denison</i> , 11 Moo. P. C. 324 | 79 |
| <i>Ditton's Case</i> , 2 Salk. 490 | 288, 544 |
| <i>Dixon v. Wells</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 249; 59 L. J. M. C. 116; 62 L. T. 812; 38 W. R. 606; 54 J. P. 725; 17 Cox C. C. 48 | 547, 550 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| <i>Dobbs v. Grand Junction Waterworks</i> , 9 App. Cas. 49; 53 L. J. Q. B. 50; 49 L. T. 541; 32 W. R. 432; 48 J. P. 5. | 54 |
| <i>Dobell v. Hutchinson</i> , 3 A. & E. 355; 5 N. & M. 251; 1 H. & W. 394. | 408 |
| <i>Dobson v. Blackmore</i> , 9 Q. B. 991; 16 L. J. Q. B. 233; 11 Jur. 556. | 582 |
| — <i>v. Festi</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 92; 60 L. J. Q. B. 481; 64 L. T. 551; 39 W. R. 481. | 204 |
| <i>Dodds v. Shepherd</i> , 1 Ex. D. 75; 45 L. J. Ex. 457; 34 L. T. 358; 24 W. R. 322. | 243 |
| <i>Doe v. Alsop</i> , 5 B. & Ald. 142. | 362 |
| — <i>v. Bancks</i> , 4 B. & A. 401; Gow. 220. | 290 |
| — <i>v. Bartle</i> , 5 B. & Ald. 492; 1 D. & R. 81. | 118 |
| — <i>v. Beynon</i> , 12 A. & E. 431; 4 P. & D. 193. | 31 |
| — <i>v. Bold</i> , 11 Q. B. 127; 13 Jur. 871. | 300 |
| — <i>v. Brandling</i> , 7 B. & C. 643; 1 M. & R. 600. | 64 |
| — <i>v. Bridges</i> , 1 B. & A. 847. | 570 |
| — <i>v. Carew</i> , 2 Q. B. 317; 1 G. & D. 640; 6 Jur. 457. | 26 |
| — <i>v. Carter</i> , 8 T. R. 57, 300; 4 R. R. 586. | 162, 170 |
| — <i>v. Chambers</i> , 4 Camp. 1. | 159 |
| — <i>v. Gooch</i> , 3 B. & Ald. 664. | 159 |
| — <i>v. Harvey</i> , 4 B. & C. 610. | 77 |
| — <i>v. Holt</i> , 21 L. J. Ex. 335. | 587 |
| — <i>v. Jesson</i> , 2 Bligh 2. | 77 |
| — <i>v. Moffatt</i> , 15 Q. B. 257; 19 L. J. Q. B. 438; 14 Jur. 935. | 26 |
| — <i>v. Olley</i> , 12 A. & E. 481; 4 P. & D. 275; 4 Jur. 1084. | 43 |
| — <i>v. Owens</i> , 9 M. & W. 455; 1 D. N. S. 404; 12 L. J. Ex. 53; 2 D. N. S. 426; 7 Jur. 91; 10 M. & W. 521. | 423 |
| — <i>v. Page</i> , 5 Q. B. 767; D. & M. 601; 13 L. J. Q. B. 153; 8 Jur. 999. | 300 |
| — <i>v. Powell</i> , 7 Dowl. 539. | 107 |
| — <i>v. Ries</i> , 8 Bing. 178; 1 M. & Scott 259. | 431 |
| — <i>v. Roe</i> , 1 Dowl. 547. | 63 |
| — <i>d. Smith v. Roe</i> , 22 L. J. Ex. 17. | 587 |
| — <i>v. Rugeley</i> , 6 Q. B. 107; 13 L. J. M. C. 137; 8 Jur. 615. | 552 |
| — <i>v. Snaith</i> , 8 Bing. 152; 1 M. & Scott 230. | 401 |
| — <i>v. Waterton</i> , 3 B. & Ald. 149. | 41, 109 |
| <i>Doggett v. Cattermoss</i> , 34 L. J. C. P. 46; 19 C. B. N. S. 765; 11 Jur. N. S. 243; 12 L. T. 355; 13 W. R. 390. | 98, 480 |
| <i>Doherty v. Allman</i> , 3 App. Cas. 728; 39 L. T. 129; 26 W. R. 513. | 173 |
| <i>Dolphin v. Layton</i> , 4 C. P. D. 130; 48 L. J. C. P. 426; 27 W. R. 786. | 78 |
| <i>Don v. Lippmann</i> , 5 Cl. & F. 1. | 213 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xliii

| | PAGE |
|--|-------------|
| <i>Donne v. Martyr</i> , 8 B. & C. 62 | 89 |
| <i>Donoghue v. Brook</i> , 57 L. J. Q. B. 122; 58 L. T. 411; 1 Fox 100 | 90 |
| <i>Dore v. Grey</i> , 2 T. R. 358; 1 R. R. 494 | 434 |
| <i>Dorin v. Dorin</i> , L. R. 7 H. L. 568; 23 W. R. 570; 33 L. T. 281; 45 L. J. Ch. 652 | 82 |
| <i>Dormont v. Furness Ry. Co.</i> , 11 Q. B. D. 496; 52 L. J. Q. B. 331; 49 L. T. 134; 47 J. P. 711; 5 Asp. M. C. 127 | 338 |
| <i>Downing v. Capel</i> , L. R. 2 C. P. 461; 36 L. J. M. C. 97; 16 L. T. 323; 15 W. R. 745 | 325 |
| <i>Dowse, The</i> , L. R. 3 Adm. 135 | 186 |
| <i>Doyle v. Falconer</i> , L. R. 1 P. C. 328; 36 L. J. P. C. 34; 15 W. R. 366; 4 Moo. P. C. C. N. S. 203 | 507 |
| <i>Drake v. Footitt</i> , 7 Q. B. D. 201; 50 L. J. M. C. 141; 45 L. T. 42; 45 J. P. 798 | 395 |
| <i>Draper v. Glenfield</i> , 2 Bulstr. 345 | 116 |
| <i>Driffield Co. v. Waterloo Co.</i> , 31 Ch. D. 638; 55 L. J. Ch. 391; 54 L. T. 210; 34 W. R. 360 | 470 |
| <i>Dresser v. Johns</i> , 6 C. B. N. S. 429; 28 L. J. C. P. 281; 5 Jur. N. S. 1262 | 78 |
| <i>Drover v. Beyer</i> , 13 Ch. D. 242; 49 L. J. Ch. 37; 41 L. T. 393; 28 W. R. 110 | 78 |
| <i>Drummond, Re</i> , [1891] 1 Ch. 524; 60 L. J. Ch. 258; 64 L. T. 246; 39 W. R. 445 | 218 |
| — <i>v. —</i> , L. R. 2 Ch. 32; 15 L. T. 337; 36 L. J. Ch. 153; 15 W. R. 267 | 38, 70, 413 |
| <i>Duck v. Addington</i> , 4 T. R. 447 | 46 |
| <i>Dudgeon v. Pembroke</i> , L. R. 9 Q. B. 581; 1 Q. B. D. 96; 34 L. T. 36 & 2 App. Cas. 284; 46 L. J. Ex. 409; 36 L. T. 382; 25 W. R. 499 | 558, 599 |
| <i>Dudley Canal v. Grazebrook</i> , 1 B. & A. 59 | 420 |
| <i>Duignan v. Walker, Johns</i> , 446; 28 L. J. Ch. 867; 5 Jur. N. S. 976; 33 L. T. O. S. 256; 7 W. R. 562 | 491 |
| <i>Duke of Buccleuch, The</i> , 15 P. D. 86 | 330 |
| <i>Dumfries, The, Swab</i> , 63 | 212, 314 |
| <i>Dunbar v. Roxburgh</i> , 3 Cl. & F. 335 | 425 |
| <i>Duncan v. So. N. E. Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 2 Sc. Ap. 20 | 245 |
| — <i>v. Lawson</i> , 41 Ch. D. 394; 58 L. J. Ch. 502; 60 L. T. 732; 37 W. R. 524; 53 J. P. 532 | 205 |
| — <i>v. Tindall</i> , 13 C. B. 258; 22 L. J. C. P. 137; 17 Jur. 347 | 296, 458 |
| <i>Dundalk Ry. Co. v. Tapster</i> , 1 Q. B. 667; 1 G. & D. 657; 2 Rly. Cas. 586; 5 Jur. 699 | 182, 571 |
| <i>Dundas v. Dutens</i> , 1 Ves. Jun. 196 | 86 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Dunelm, The, 9 P. D. 171 ; 53 L. J. P. 81 ; 51 L. T. 214 ; 39 W. R. 970 ; 5 Asp. M. C. 304 | 77 |
| Dunn, <i>Ex parte</i> , 23 Q. B. D. 461 ; 58 L. J. Q. B. 375 ; 61 L. T. 543 ; 37 W. R. 537 ; 6 M. B. R. 138 | 278 |
| — <i>v. Birmingham Canal Co.</i> , L. R. 8 Q. B. 42 ; 42 L. J. Q. B. 34 ; 27 L. T. 683 ; 21 W. R. 266 | 503 |
| Dunston <i>v. Paterson</i> , 5 C. B. N. S. 267 ; 28 L. J. C. P. 185 ; 5 Jur. N. S. 516 ; 33 L. T. O. S. 222 ; 7 W. R. 163 | 90 |
| Durant <i>v. Withers</i> , L. R. 9 C. P. 257 ; 43 L. J. C. P. 113 ; 22 W. R. 156 ; 2 Hop. & C. 202 | 165 |
| Durham C. C. <i>v. Chester-le-Street</i> , [1891] 1 Q. B. 330 ; 60 L. J. M. C. 9 ; 63 L. T. 461 ; 39 W. R. 188 ; 54 J. P. 759 | 189 |
| Dutton <i>v. Atkins</i> , L. R. 6 Q. B. 373 ; 40 L. J. M. C. 157 ; 24 L. T. 507 ; 19 W. R. 799 | 288 |
| Dyer <i>v. Best</i> , L. R. 1 Ex. 152 ; 35 L. J. Ex. 105 ; 12 Jur. N. S. 142 ; 13 L. T. 753 ; 14 W. R. 336 ; 4 H. & C. 189 | 426 |
| Dyke <i>v. Elliot</i> , L. R. 4 P. C. 184 ; 41 L. J. Adm. 65 ; 26 L. T. 45 ; 20 W. R. 497 | 392 |
| — <i>v. Gower</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 220 ; 61 L. J. M. C. 70 ; 65 L. T. 760 ; 56 J. P. 168 ; 17 Cox 421 | 143 |
| Dyson <i>v. London and N. W. Ry.</i> , 7 Q. B. D. 32 ; 50 L. J. M. C. 78 ; 44 L. T. 609 ; 29 W. R. 565 ; 45 J. P. 650 | 417 |

E.

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Eably's Case, Bulstr. 345 | 174 |
| Earl of Auckland, The, 30 L. J. Adm. 121 ; Lush 164 | 416 |
| Earl Cornwallis, <i>Re</i> , 11 Ex. 580 ; 25 L. J. Ex. 149 | 304 |
| Earle <i>v. Rowcroft</i> , 8 East 126 ; 9 R. R. 385 | 149 |
| East Anglian Ry. Co. <i>v. E. C. Ry. Co.</i> , 11 C. B. 775 ; 21 L. J. C. P. 23 ; 16 Jur. 249 | 496, 539 |
| East Gloucestershire Ry. Co. <i>v. Bartholomew</i> , L. R. 2 Ex. 15 ; 37 L. J. Ex. 17 ; 17 L. T. 256 | 128, 291 |
| East India Co. <i>v. Paul</i> , 7 Moo. P. C. C. 85 ; 14 Jur. 253 | 321, 545 |
| East London Ry. Co. <i>v. Whitechurch</i> , L. R. 7 H. L. 81 ; 43 L. J. M. C. 159 ; 30 L. T. 412 ; 22 W. R. 665 | 23, 24, 55, 328 |
| East London Waterworks Co. <i>v. Mile End</i> , 17 Q. B. 512 ; 2 E. & E. 447 ; 21 L. J. M. C. 49 ; 17 Jur. 121 | 474 |
| East and West India Dock Co. <i>v. Hill</i> , 9 App. Cas. 448 ; 53 L. J. Ch. 842 ; 47 L. T. 270 ; 31 W. R. 55 | 154 |
| — <i>v. Shaw</i> , 39 Ch. D. 531 ; 57 L. J. Ch. 1041 ; 60 L. T. 142 ; 6 N. & M. 94 | 57 |
| East <i>v. Pell</i> , 4 M. & W. 665 ; 1 H. & H. 421 | 498 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xlv

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Eastern Archip. Co. v. R., 1 E. & B. 310; 2 E. & B. 857; 23 L. J. Q. B. 82; 18 Jur. 481 | 461 |
| Eastern Counties Ry. Co. v. Marriage, 9 H. L. Cas. 32; 31 L. J. Exch. 73; 7 Jur. N. S. 53; 8 W. R. 748 | 71 |
| Eastwood v. Miller, L. R. 9 Q. B. 440; 43 L. J. M. C. 139; 30 L. T. 716; 22 W. R. 799 | 394, 481 |
| Eaton v. Basker, 7 Q. B. D. 529; 50 L. J. Q. B. 444; 44 L. T. 703; 29 W. R. 597; 45 J. P. 616 | 539 |
| Ebbs v. Boulnois, L. R. 10 Ch. 479; 44 L. J. Ch. 691; 33 L. T. 342; 23 W. R. 820 | 324 |
| Ecclesiastical Commrs. v. N. E. Ry. Co., 4 Ch. D. 845; 47 L. J. Ch. 20; 36 L. T. 174 | 8 |
| Ecclesiastical persons, Case of, 5 Rep. 14 a. | 192 |
| Eddington v. Borman, 4 T. R. 4 | 245 |
| Eddlestone v. Barnes, 1 Ex. D. 67; 45 L. J. M. C. 73; 34 L. T. 497 | 263, 395 |
| Edgware Highway Board v. Harrow Gas Co., L. R. 10 Q. B. 92; 44 L. J. Q. B. 1; 31 L. T. 402. | 443 |
| Edinburgh Tramways Co. v. Torbain, 3 App. Cas. 68; 37 L. T. 288 | 27 |
| Edward v. Trevellick, 4 E. & B. 59; 2 C. L. R. 1605; 24 L. J. Q. B. 9; 1 Jur. N. S. 110 | 135 |
| Edwards v. The Aberayron Mutual Ship Ins. Soc. (Lim.), 1 Q. B. D. 563; 34 L. T. 457 | 178, 408 |
| — v. Coombe, L. R. 7 C. P. 519; 41 L. J. C. P. 202; 27 L. T. 315; 21 W. R. 107 | 181 |
| — v. Dick, 4 B. & Ald. 212 | 128, 290 |
| — v. Edwards, 2 Ch. D. 291; 45 L. J. Ch. 391; 34 L. T. 472; 24 W. R. 713 | 161, 363 |
| — v. Hall, 3 De G. M. & G. 84; 25 L. J. Ch. 82; 1 Jur. N. S. 1189 | 167 |
| — v. Islington (St. Mary), 22 Q. B. D. 338; 58 L. J. Q. B. 165; 60 L. T. 851; 37 W. R. 753 | 101 |
| — v. Roberts, [1891] 1 Q. B. 302; 60 L. J. M. C. 6; 55 J. P. 439 | 544 |
| — v. Rusholme, L. R. 4 Q. B. 554; 17 W. R. 821; 38 L. J. M. C. 153; 10 B. & S. 526 | 62, 71 |
| — v. R., 9 Ex. 628; 2 C. L. R. 590; 23 L. J. Ex. 42; 18 Jur. 384 | 191, 489 |
| Eede, <i>In re</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 228; 59 L. J. Q. B. 376; 38 W. R. 683 | 574 |
| Eggington v. Lichfield, 5 E. & B. 100; 24 L. J. Q. B. 360; 1 Jur. N. S. 908 | 490 |
| Elder v. Carter, 25 Q. B. D. 194; 59 L. J. Q. B. 281; 62 L. T. 516; 38 W. R. 612; 54 J. P. 692 | 117 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------|
| Ellerton, <i>Ex parte</i> , 33 L. J. Bkcy. 32; 10 Jur. 502; 10 L. T. 317, 722 | 239 |
| Elliot v. Richardson, L. R. 5 C. P. 744; 39 L. J. C. P. 340; 22 L. T. 858; 18 W. R. 1157 | 557 |
| Elliott, <i>Re</i> , 39 W. R. 297 | 206 |
| — v. Majendie, L. R. 7 Q. B. 429; 41 L. J. M. C. 147; 26 L. T. 504; 20 W. R. 721 | 378 |
| — v. Swartout, 10 Peters 137 | 82 |
| Ellis v. Kelly, 6 H. & N. 222; 30 L. J. M. C. 35; 6 Jur. N. S. 113 | 147 |
| — v. McCormick, L. R. 4 Q. B. 271; 38 L. J. Q. B. 127; 20 L. T. 223; 17 W. R. 506; 10 B. & S. 83 | 369 |
| Elston v. Braddick, 2 Cr. & M. 435 | 303 |
| — v. Rose, L. R. 4 Q. B. 4; 19 L. T. 280; 17 W. R. 52; 9 B. & S. 509; 38 L. J. Q. B. 6 | 53 |
| Ely, Dean of, v. Bliss, 5 Beav. 574 | 229 |
| — v. Cash, 15 M. & W. 617; 15 L. J. Ex. 341 | 228 |
| Emanuel v. Constable, 3 Russ. 526 | 63, 71 |
| Emerson v. Newfoundland, 8 Moo. P. C. 157 | 512 |
| Enderby v. Gilpin, 5 Moo. 571 | 159 |
| Englishman, <i>The</i> , 3 P. D. 18; 47 L. J. Adm. 9; 27 L. T. 412 | 279 |
| Enraght v. Lord Penzance, 7 App. Cas. 240; 51 L. J. Q. B. 506; 46 L. T. 779; 30 W. R. 753; 46 J. P. 644 | 249 |
| Erichsen v. Last, 8 Q. B. D. 414; 51 L. J. Q. B. 86; 45 L. T. 703; 30 W. R. 301; 46 J. P. 357 | 207 |
| Eslick, <i>Re</i> , 4 Ch. D. 496; 46 L. J. Bkcy. 30; 35 L. T. 914; 25 W. R. 260 | 132 |
| Etherington v. Wilson, 1 Ch. D. 160; 45 L. J. Ch. 153; 33 L. T. 652; 24 W. R. 303 | 166 |
| Evans v. Davies, [1893] 2 Ch. 216; 62 L. J. Ch. 661; 68 L. T. 244; 41 W. R. 687 | 97, 462 |
| — v. Hoare, [1892] 1 Q. B. 593; 61 L. J. Q. B. 470; 66 L. T. 345; 40 W. R. 442; 56 J. P. 664 | 410 |
| — v. Jones, 2 B. & S. 45 | 19 |
| — v. Rees, 9 C. B. N. S. 391; 20 L. J. C. P. 13 | 242 |
| — v. —, 2 Q. B. 334; 1 G. & D. 579; 1 D. N. S. 338; 5 Jur. 1060 | 407 |
| — v. Stevens, 4 T. R. 224, 459 | 77, 483 |
| — v. Williams, 2 Dr. & Sm. 324; 34 L. J. Ch. 661; 11 Jur. N. S. 256; 12 L. T. 762; 13 W. R. 423 | 307 |
| Evans' Case, Cro. Car. 473 | 54 |
| Evatt v. Hunt, 2 E. & B. 374; 22 L. J. Q. B. 348; 17 Jur. 1028 | 468 |
| Everard v. Kendall, L. R. 5 C. P. 428; 39 L. J. C. P. 234; 22 L. T. 408; 18 W. R. 892 | 186 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xlvii

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Everett v. Wells, 2 M. & Gr. 269; 9 D. P. C. 424; 2 Scott N. R. 525 | 3, 18 |
| Eversfield v. Mid Sussex Ry. Co., 3 De G. & J. 286; 5 Jur. N. S. 776 | 420 |
| Ewart v. Graham, 7 H. L. C. 331; 29 L. J. Ex. 88; 5 Jur. N. S. 773; 33 L. T. O. S. 349; 7 W. R. 621 | 436 |
| Explorer, The, L. R. 3 Ad. 289; 40 L. J. A. 41; 23 L. T. 604; 19 W. R. 166 | 211 |
| Eyre & Leicester Corpn., Re, [1892] 1 Q. B. 136; 61 L. J. Q. B. 438; 65 L. T. 733; 40 W. R. 203; 56 J. P. 228 | 322, 337 |
| Eyre v. Waller, 5 H. & N. 460; 29 L. J. Ex. 247; 2 L. T. 253; 6 Jur. N. S. 512; 8 W. R. 450 | 53 |
| Eyston v. Studd, Plow. 465 | 30, 136 |

F.

| | |
|--|----------|
| Fanny Carvill, The, 13 App. Cas. 455 n.; 32 L. T. 646; 2 Asp. M. C. 565 | 279 |
| Farley v. Bonham, 2 Johns. & H. 177; 30 L. J. Ch. 239; 7 Jur. N. S. 232; 3 L. T. 806; 9 W. R. 299 | 38, 251 |
| — v. Bryant, 3 A. & E. 839; 1 H. & W. 775 | 69 |
| Farrell v. Tomlinson, 5 Bro. P. C. 438 | 9, 10 |
| Feather v. R., 6 B. & S. 257; 35 L. J. Q. B. 200; 12 L. T. 114 | 431, 461 |
| Fellowes v. Clay, 4 Q. B. 313 | 64, 69 |
| Fennell v. Ridler, 5 B. & C. 406; 8 D. & R. 204 | 399, 556 |
| Fenton v. Hampton, 11 Moo. P. C. C. 347; 6 W. R. 341 | 507 |
| Fenwick v. E. London Ry. Co., L. R. 20 Eq. 544; 44 L. J. Ch. 602; 23 W. R. 901 | 80, 420 |
| — v. Schmaltz, L. R. 3 C. P. 313; 37 L. J. C. P. 78; 18 L. T. 27; 16 W. R. 481 | 469 |
| Ferguson & Hutchinson, Ex parte, L. R. 6 Q. B. 280; 40 L. J. Q. B. 105; 24 L. T. 96; 19 W. R. 746 | 100, 386 |
| — v. Norman, 6 Scott 794; 5 Bing. N. C. 76; 1 Arm. 418; 3 Jur. 10 | 564 |
| Ferrand v. Hallas Land Co., [1893] 2 Q. B. 135; 62 L. J. Q. B. 479; 69 L. T. 8; 41 W. R. 580; 57 J. P. 692 | 283 |
| Fielding v. Bhyll, 3 C. P. D. 272; 38 L. T. 223; 26 L. T. 881 | 417 |
| Finch v. Finch, 45 L. J. Ch. 816; 35 L. T. 235 | 213 |
| Firebrace v. Firebrace, 4 P. D. 63; 47 L. J. P. 41; 39 L. T. 94; 26 W. R. 617 | 195 |
| Fisher v. Blight, 2 Cranch 399 | 4 |
| — v. Bridges, 3 E. & B. 642; 23 L. J. Q. B. 276; 1 Jur. N. S. 157 | 559 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| <i>Fisher v. Howard</i> , 34 L. J. M. C. 42 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 304 ; 11 L. T. 373 ; 13 W. R. 145 | 93 |
| <i>Fishmongers' Co. v. Dimsdale</i> , 12 C. B. 557 | 404 |
| <i>Fitzgerald v. Champneys</i> , 2 Johns. & H. 31 ; 30 L. J. Ch. 777 ; 7 Jur. N. S. 1006 ; 5 L. T. 233 ; 9 W. R. 850 | 244, 248 |
| <i>Fitzpatrick v. Kelly</i> , L. R. 8 Q. B. 337 ; 42 L. J. M. C. 132 ; 28 L. T. 558 ; 21 W. R. 681 | 43, 450 |
| <i>Flannigan v. Bishop Wearmouth</i> , 8 E. & B. 451 ; 27 L. J. M. C. 46 ; 3 Jur. N. S. 1103 | 374 |
| <i>Fleming v. Self</i> , 3 De G. M. & G. 997 ; 3 Eq. 14 ; 24 L. J. Ch. 29 ; 1 Jur. N. S. 25 | 124 |
| <i>Fletcher v. Calthrop</i> , 6 Q. B. 880 ; 14 L. J. Q. B. 49 ; 9 Jur. 205 ; 1 New Sess. Cas. 529 | 184, 368 |
| — <i>v. Fields</i> , [1891] 1 Q. B. 790 ; 60 L. J. M. C. 102 ; 64 L. T. 472 ; 39 W. R. 655 ; 55 J. P. 502 | 376 |
| — <i>v. Hudson</i> , 7 Q. B. D. 611 ; 51 L. J. Q. B. 48 ; 46 L. T. 125 ; 30 W. R. 349 ; 46 J. P. 372 | 370 |
| — <i>v. Rylands</i> , L. R. 3 H. L. 330 ; 37 L. J. Ex. 161 ; 19 L. T. 220 | 506 |
| — <i>v. Sondes</i> , 3 Bing. 580 ; 1 Bligh N. S. 144 | 369, 484 |
| <i>Flight v. Salter</i> , 1 B. & A. 673 | 169 |
| <i>Flint v. Barnard</i> , 22 Q. B. D. 90 ; 58 L. J. Q. B. 53 ; 37 W. R. 185 | 79 |
| <i>Flower v. Lloyd</i> , 6 Ch. D. 297 ; 46 L. J. Ch. 838 ; 35 L. T. 454 ; 25 W. R. 793 | 412 |
| — <i>v. Low Leyton</i> , 5 Ch. D. 347 ; 46 L. J. Ch. 621 ; 36 L. T. 760 ; 25 W. R. 545 | 280 |
| <i>Floyer v. Edwards</i> , 1 Cowp. 114 | 159 |
| <i>Foat v. Mayor of Margate</i> , 11 Q. B. D. 299 ; 52 L. J. Q. B. 711 ; 47 J. P. 535 | 280 |
| <i>Foley v. Fletcher</i> , 3 H. & N. 769 ; 28 L. J. Ex. 100 ; 5 Jur. N. S. 342 | 369, 399 |
| — <i>v. Inland Revenue Com.</i> , L. R. 3 Ex. 263 ; 37 L. J. Ex. 109 | 240 |
| <i>Folkestone Corp. v. Woodward</i> , L. R. 15 Eq. 159 ; 42 L. J. Ch. 782 ; 27 L. T. 574 | 387 |
| <i>Foot v. Truro</i> , 1 Stra. 625 | 534 |
| <i>Forbes v. Cochrane</i> , 2 B. & C. 448 ; 2 D. & R. 679 | 203 |
| — <i>v. Eccles Com.</i> , L. R. 15 Eq. 51 ; 42 L. J. Ch. 77 ; 27 L. T. 511 ; 21 W. R. 169 | 119 |
| — <i>v. Lee Cons. Board</i> , 4 Ex. D. 116 ; 48 L. J. Ex. 402 ; 27 W. R. 688 | 508 |
| — <i>v. Smith</i> , 11 Ex. 161 ; 24 L. J. Ex. 299 ; 1 Jur. N. S. 503 | 322 |
| <i>Ford, Re</i> , 10 Ch. D. 365 ; 48 L. J. Ch. 327 ; 40 L. T. 41 ; 27 W. R. 371 | 430 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xlix

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| <i>Ford v. Drew</i> , 5 C. P. D. 59; 49 L. J. C. P. 172; 41 L. T. 478; | |
| 28 W. R. 137 | 89 |
| — <i>v. Hart</i> , L. R. 9 C. P. 273; 43 L. J. C. P. 24; 29 L. T. 685; | |
| 22 W. R. 159; 2 Hop. & C. 167 | 90 |
| — <i>v. Kettle</i> , 9 Q. B. D. 139; 51 L. J. Q. B. 558; 46 L. T. 666; | |
| 30 W. R. 741 | 10, 287 |
| — <i>v. Metrop. Ry. Co.</i> , 17 Q. B. D. 12; 55 L. J. Q. B. 296; 54 | |
| L. T. 718; 34 W. R. 426; 50 J. P. 661 | 131 |
| — <i>v. Pye</i> , L. R. 9 C. P. 269; 43 L. J. C. P. 21; 29 L. T. 684; | |
| 22 W. R. 159; 2 Hop. & C. 157 | 90 |
| — <i>v. Wiley</i> , 23 Q. B. D. 203; 58 L. J. M. C. 145; 60 L. T. 74; | |
| 37 W. R. 709; 53 J. P. 485; 16 Cox C. C. 683 | 149 |
| <i>Foreman v. Canterbury (Mayor of)</i> , L. R. 6 Q. B. 214; 40 L. J. | |
| Q. B. 138; 24 L. T. 385; 19 W. R. 719 | 583 |
| <i>Forsdike v. Colquhoun</i> , 11 Q. B. D. 71; 49 L. T. 136; 47 J. P. | |
| 393 | 111 |
| — <i>v. Stone</i> , L. R. 3 C. P. 607; 37 L. J. C. P. 301 | 487 |
| <i>Forster v. Taylor</i> , 5 B. & A. 887 | 560 |
| <i>Fortescue v. St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 170; | |
| 60 L. J. M. C. 172; 63 L. T. 443; 39 W. R. 31 | 261 |
| <i>Forth v. Chapman</i> , 1 P. Wms. 663 | 447 |
| <i>Foster v. Diphwys Casson Slate Co.</i> , 18 Q. B. D. 429; 56 L. J. | |
| M. C. 21; 51 J. P. 470 | 97, 465 |
| — <i>v. Gt. W. Ry. Co.</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 515; 51 L. J. Q. B. 233; 46 | |
| L. T. 74; 30 W. R. 398 | 115 |
| — <i>v. Oxford, &c. Ry. Co.</i> , 13 C. B. 200; 22 L. J. C. P. 99; 17 | |
| Jur. 167 | 562 |
| <i>Foster's Case</i> , 5 Rep. 59 | 218 |
| —, 11 Rep. 63 a | 227, 255 |
| <i>Fotherby v. Metrop. Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 2 C. P. 188; 36 L. J. C. P. | |
| 88; 12 Jur. N. S. 1005; 15 L. T. 243; 15 W. R. 112 | 576 |
| <i>Foulger v. Steadman</i> , L. R. 8 Q. B. 65; 42 L. J. M. C. 3; 26 L. | |
| T. 395 | 148 |
| — <i>v. Taylor</i> , 5 H. & N. 202; 29 L. J. Ex. 154; 8 W. R. 279 | 443 |
| <i>Fowler v. Barstow</i> , 20 Ch. D. 240; 51 L. J. Ch. 103; 45 L. T. | |
| 603; 30 W. R. 113 | 413 |
| — <i>v. Padget</i> , 7 T. R. 509; 4 R. R. 511 | 332 |
| <i>Fox v. Wallis</i> , 2 C. P. D. 45; 35 L. T. 690; 25 W. R. 287 | 526 |
| <i>Foxon v. Gascoigne</i> , L. R. 9 Ch. 654; 43 L. J. Ch. 729; 31 L. T. | |
| 289; 22 W. R. 939 | 17 |
| <i>France v. Dutton</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 208; 60 L. J. Q. B. 448; 64 | |
| L. T. 793; 39 W. R. 696 | 102 |
| <i>Francis v. Dodsworth</i> , 4 C. B. 220; 17 L. J. C. P. 185 | 78 |

d

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| <i>Francois v. Maas</i> , 3 Q. B. D. 341 ; 47 L. J. M. C. 83 ; 38 L. T. 100 ; 26 W. R. 422 | 70 |
| <i>Franconia, The</i> , 2 P. D. 163 ; 46 L. J. Adm. 33 ; 36 L. T. 640 ; 25 W. R. 796 | 47, 445 |
| <i>Frankland, Re</i> , L. R. 8 Q. B. 18 ; 42 L. J. Q. B. 13 ; 28 L. T. 18 | 49 |
| <i>Franklin v. B. of England</i> , 1 Russ. 575 ; 9 B. & C. 156 ; 4 M. & R. 11 | 362 |
| <i>Frape, Re</i> , [1893] 2 Ch. 284 ; 62 L. J. Ch. 473 ; 68 L. T. 558 ; 41 W. R. 417 | 270 |
| <i>Fraser v. Hill</i> , 4 Macq. H. L. Cas. 392 ; 1 C. L. R. 7 | 558 |
| <i>Fredericks v. Howie</i> , 1 H. & C. 381 ; 31 L. J. M. C. 249 ; 8 Jur. N. S. 750 ; 6 L. T. 544 ; 10 W. R. 796 | 474 |
| <i>Free v. Burgoyne</i> , 2 Bligh N. S. 78 ; 5 B. & C. 400 ; 6 B. & C. 27, 538 ; 9 D. & R. 14 | 58 |
| <i>Freeman v. Appleyard</i> , 32 L. J. Ex. 175 ; 7 L. T. 282 ; 1 N. R. 30 | 462 |
| — <i>v. Moyes</i> , 1 A. & E. 338 ; 3 N. & M. 883 | 316 |
| — <i>v. Read</i> , 9 C. B. N. S. 301 ; 30 L. J. M. C. 123 ; 9 W. R. 141 ; 7 Jur. N. S. 846 | 175, 221 |
| — <i>v. —</i> , 4 B. & S. 174 ; 32 L. J. M. C. 226 ; 10 Jur. N. S. 149 ; 8 L. T. 458 ; 11 W. R. 802 | 487, 547 |
| — <i>v. Tranoh</i> , 12 C. B. 406 ; 21 L. J. C. P. 214 ; 16 Jur. 1141. | 19 |
| <i>Freestone, Ex parte</i> , 25 L. J. M. C. 121 ; 1 H. & N. 93 ; 2 Jur. N. S. 525 | 461 |
| <i>Freke v. Carbery</i> , L. R. 16 Eq. 461 | 205 |
| <i>Fremantle v. London and N. W. Ry. Co.</i> , 10 C. B. N. S. 89 ; 31 L. J. C. P. 12 ; 9 W. R. 611 ; 2 F. & F. 337 | 503 |
| <i>Fremington School, Re</i> , 10 Jur. 512 | 515 |
| <i>Frend v. Dennett</i> , 4 C. B. N. S. 576 ; 27 L. J. C. P. 314 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 897 | 525, 539 |
| <i>Fricke v. Poole</i> , 9 B. & C. 543 ; 4 M. & R. 48 | 368 |
| <i>Fritz v. Hobson</i> , 14 Ch. D. 542 ; 49 L. J. Ch. 735 ; 42 L. T. 677 ; 28 W. R. 722 | 249 |
| <i>Fryer, Ex parte</i> , 17 Q. B. D. 718 ; 55 L. J. Q. B. 478 ; 55 L. T. 276 ; 34 W. R. 766 ; 3 M. B. R. 231 | 78 |
| <i>Fuentes v. Montes</i> , L. R. 3 C. P. 263 ; L. R. 4 C. P. 93 ; 38 L. J. C. P. 95 ; 19 L. T. 364 ; 17 W. R. 208 | 123 |
| <i>Fuller v. Redman</i> , 26 Beav. 600 ; 29 L. J. Ch. 324 ; 5 Jur. N. S. 1045 | 21, 585 |
| <i>Furnivall v. Coombes</i> , 5 M. & G. 736 | 216 |
| — <i>v. Hudson</i> , [1893] 1 Ch. 335 ; 62 L. J. Ch. 178 ; 68 L. T. 378 ; 41 W. R. 358 | 102 |
| <i>Fusilier, The</i> , 34 L. J. P. M. & A. 27 ; 3 Moo. P. C. C. N. S. 51 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 289 ; 12 L. T. 186 ; 13 W. R. 592 | 77, 86 |

G.

| | PAGE |
|--|--------------------|
| <i>Gale v. Laurie</i> , 5 B. & C. 156 | 412, 452 |
| <i>Galena v. Amy</i> , 5 Wallace 705 | 348 |
| <i>Gallini v. Laborie</i> , 5 T. R. 242 ; 2 R. R. 581 | 557 |
| <i>Galloway v. M. of London</i> , L. R. 1 H. L. 34 ; 35 L. J. Ch. 477 ; 12 Jur. N. S. 747 ; 14 L. T. 865 | 422 |
| — <i>v. Maries</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 275 ; 51 L. J. M. C. 53 ; 45 L. T. 763 ; 30 W. R. 151 ; 46 J. P. 326 | 481 |
| <i>Gallsworthy v. Selby Commissioners</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 348 ; 61 L. J. Q. B. 372 ; 66 L. T. 17 ; 56 J. P. 356 | 504 |
| <i>Gambart v. Ball</i> , 14 C. B. N. S. 306 ; 32 L. J. C. P. 166 ; 8 L. T. 426 ; 9 Jur. N. S. 1059 ; 11 W. R. 699 | 110, 382 |
| — <i>v. Sumner</i> , 5 H. & N. 5 ; 29 L. J. Ex. 98 ; 5 Jur. N. S. 1109 ; 8 W. R. 27 | 222 |
| <i>Gambier v. Lydford</i> , 3 E. & B. 346 ; 23 L. J. M. C. 61 ; 2 C. L. R. 951 ; 18 Jur. 352 | 189 |
| <i>Gapp v. Bond</i> , 19 Q. B. D. 200 ; 56 L. J. Q. B. 438 ; 57 L. T. 437 ; 35 W. R. 683 | 100 |
| <i>Garby v. Harris</i> , 7 Ex. 591 ; 21 L. J. Ex. 160 ; 16 Jur. 456 | 323 |
| <i>Gardiner, Re</i> , 20 Q. B. D. 249 ; 57 L. J. Q. B. 149 ; 58 L. T. 119 ; 36 W. R. 142 ; 5 M. B. R. 1 | 379, 498 |
| <i>Gardner v. Lucas</i> , 3 App. Cas. 582 | 302, 314 |
| — <i>v. Mansbridge</i> , 19 Q. B. D. 217 ; 57 L. T. 265 ; 35 W. R. 809 ; 51 J. P. 612 ; 16 Cox C. C. 281 | 271 |
| — <i>v. Whitford</i> , 4 C. B. N. S. 665 | 222, 251 |
| <i>Garland v. Meade</i> , L. R. 6 Q. B. 411 ; 40 L. J. Q. B. 179 ; 24 L. T. 421 ; 19 W. R. 1156 | 118 |
| <i>Garnett v. Bradley</i> , 3 App. Cas. 966 ; 48 L. J. Ex. 186 ; 39 L. T. 261 ; 26 W. R. 698 | 218, 221, 243, 244 |
| <i>Garrod, Doe d., v. Olley</i> , 12 A. & E. 481 ; 4 P. & D. 275 ; 4 Jur. 1084 | 43 |
| <i>Gaskell v. King</i> , 11 East 165 ; 10 R. & B. 462 | 443, 566 |
| <i>Gaslight Co. v. Hardy</i> , 17 Q. B. D. 619 ; 56 L. J. Q. B. 168 ; 55 L. T. 585 ; 35 W. R. 50 ; 51 J. P. 6 | 83 |
| — <i>v. St. Mary Abbots</i> , 15 Q. B. D. 1 ; 54 L. J. Q. B. 414 ; 33 W. R. 892 | 506 |
| — <i>v. Turner</i> , 6 Bing. N. C. 324 ; 8 Scott 609 | 559 |
| <i>Gatty v. Fry</i> , 2 Ex. D. 265 ; 46 L. J. Ex. 605 ; 36 L. T. 182 ; 25 W. R. 305 | 171, 273 |
| <i>Gaudet v. Brown</i> , L. R. 5 P. C. 134 ; 42 L. J. Adm. 1 ; 28 L. T. 77 ; 21 W. R. 420 | 25, 186 |
| <i>Gauntlett, The</i> , L. R. 4 P. C. 184 ; 41 L. J. Adm. 65 ; 26 L. T. 45 | 369 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| Gearns <i>v.</i> Baker, L. R. 10 Ch. 355 ; 44 L. J. Ch. 334 ; 33 L. T. 86 ; 23 W. R. 543 | 505 |
| Geddis <i>v.</i> Bann Reservoir Co., 3 App. Cas. 430 | 503, 505 |
| Geere <i>v.</i> Mare, 2 H. & C. 339 ; 33 L. J. Ex. 50 ; 8 L. T. 463 | 559 |
| General Auction Co. <i>v.</i> Smith, [1891] 3 Ch. 432 ; 60 L. J. Ch. 723 ; 65 L. T. 188 ; 40 W. R. 106 | 502 |
| General Iron Screw Co. <i>v.</i> Schumanns, 1 John. & H. 180 ; 29 L. J. Ch. 877 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 883 ; 8 W. R. 732 ; 4 L. T. 138 | 212 |
| General St. Nav. Co. <i>v.</i> Brit. and Col. St. Nav., L. R. 4 Ex. 238 ; 38 L. J. Ex. 97 ; 20 L. T. 581 ; 17 W. R. 741 | 452 |
| — <i>v.</i> Guillon, 11 M. & W. 877 ; 13 L. J. Ex. 168 | 213 |
| George, <i>Re</i> , 44 Ch. D. 627 ; 59 L. J. Ch. 709 ; 63 L. T. 49 ; 38 W. R. 617 | 18 |
| Gerard's Estate, <i>Re</i> Lord, [1893] 3 Ch. 251 ; 63 L. J. Ch. 23 ; 69 L. T. 393 | 53 |
| Gibbs <i>v.</i> Guild, 9 Q. B. D. 59 ; 51 L. J. Q. B. 313 ; 46 L. T. 248 ; 30 W. R. 591 | 8 |
| — <i>v.</i> Lawrence, 30 L. J. Ch. 170 | 473 |
| — <i>v.</i> Liverpool Docks, 3 H. & N. 164 ; 27 L. J. Ex. 321 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 636 | 131 |
| — <i>v.</i> Mersey Docks, L. R. 1 H. L. 93 ; 35 L. J. Ex. 225 ; 12 Jur. N. S. 571 | 504 |
| — <i>v.</i> Stead, 8 B. & C. 528 ; 2 M. & R. 457 | 488 |
| Giblett <i>v.</i> Hobson, 3 M. & K. 517 | 164 |
| Gibson <i>v.</i> Holland, L. R. 1 C. P. 8 ; 1 H. & R. 1 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 1022 ; 35 L. J. C. P. 5 ; 14 W. R. 86 ; 13 L. T. 293 | 208, 209, 408 |
| — <i>v.</i> Preston, L. R. 5 Q. B. 219 ; 39 L. J. Q. B. 131 ; 22 L. T. 293 ; 18 W. R. 689 ; 10 B. & S. 942 | 236, 583 |
| Gifford, <i>Re</i> , 20 Q. B. D. 368 ; 57 L. J. Q. B. 181 ; 58 L. T. 522 ; 36 W. R. 468 ; 52 J. P. 119 | 526 |
| — <i>v.</i> St. Luke's, Chelsea, 24 Q. B. D. 141 ; 59 L. J. Q. B. 612 ; 61 L. T. 388 ; 54 J. P. 104 | 523 |
| Gildart <i>v.</i> Gladstone, 11 East 675 ; 12 East 439, 668 | 420 |
| Giles <i>v.</i> Grover, 1 Cl. & F. 74 ; 2 M. & Scott 197 ; 9 Bing. 128 | 191, 489 |
| Gilmore <i>v.</i> Shuter, 2 Lev. 227 ; 2 Mod. Rep. 310 | 300 |
| Girdlestone <i>v.</i> Allan, 1 B. & C. 61 | 339 |
| Glasgow Ry. Co. <i>v.</i> Hunter, L. R. 2 Sc. App. 78 | 131 |
| Gleaves <i>v.</i> Marriner, 1 Ex. D. 107 ; 34 L. T. 496 ; 24 W. R. 539 | 530 |
| Glossop <i>v.</i> Heston Local Board, 12 Ch. D. 102 ; 49 L. J. Ch. 89 ; 40 L. T. 736 ; 28 W. R. 111 | 581, 582 |
| Goddard, <i>Re</i> , 1 L. M. & P. 25 ; 19 L. J. Q. B. 305 | 567 |
| Golding <i>v.</i> Stocking, L. R. 4 Q. B. 516 ; 38 L. J. M. C. 122 ; 20 L. T. 479 ; 17 W. R. 722 ; 10 B. & S. 348 | 391 |

TABLE OF CASES.

liii

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------|
| Goldring, Re , 22 Q. B. D. 87; 58 L. J. Q. B. 3; 60 L. T. 138; 37 W. R. 228; 5 M. B. R. 265 | 498 |
| Goldshede v. Swan , 1 Ex. 154; 16 L. J. Ex. 284 | 32 |
| Goldsmid v. Hampton , 5 C. B. N. S. 94; 27 L. J. C. P. 286; 4 Jur. N. S. 1108 | 50, 432 |
| Goldson v. Buck , 15 East 372 | 250 |
| Goodman's Trusts, Re , 17 Ch. D. 266; 50 L. J. Ch. 425; 44 L. T. 527; 29 W. R. 586 | 195 |
| Gordon v. G. W. R. , 8 Q. B. D. 44; 51 L. J. Q. B. 58; 45 L. T. 509; 30 W. R. 230; 46 J. P. 294 | 288 |
| — <i>v. Howden</i> , 12 Cl. & F. 237 | 558 |
| — <i>v. Jennings</i> , 9 Q. B. D. 45; 51 L. J. Q. B. 417; 46 L. T. 534; 30 W. R. 704; 46 J. P. 519 | 470 |
| Gore v. Grey , 13 C. B. N. S. 138; 32 L. J. C. P. 100 | 219 |
| Goreley, Ex parte , 4 De G. J. & S. 477; 34 L. J. Bkcy. 1; 10 Jur. N. S. 1085; 11 L. T. 319; 13 W. R. 60. | 51, 66, 452 |
| Gorham v. Exeter (Bp.) , Moore 462; 2 Rob. Ec. Rep. 1; 13 Jur. 238 | 33 |
| — <i>v. —</i> 15 Q. B. 52; 10 C. B. 102; 5 Ex. 630; 19 L. J. Q. B. 279; 19 L. J. C. P. 200; 19 L. J. Ex. 376; 14 Jur. 480, 522, 876 | 427 |
| Gorman, Ex parte , [1894] App. Cas. 23; 63 L. J. M. C. 84; 70 L. T. 46; 58 J. P. 316 | 175 |
| Gorris v. Scott , L. R. 9 Ex. 125; 43 L. J. Ex. 92; 30 L. T. 431; 22 W. R. 575 | 583 |
| Gough v. Davies , 2 K. & J. 623; 25 L. J. Ch. 677 | 65 |
| Gould v. Haynes , 59 L. J. M. C. 9; 61 L. T. 732; 54 J. P. 405; 16 Cox C. C. 732 | 159 |
| Gover's Case , 1 Ch. D. 182; 45 L. J. Ch. 83; 33 L. T. 619; 24 W. R. 125 | 577 |
| Gowan v. Wright , 18 Q. B. D. 201; 56 L. J. Q. B. 131; 35 W. R. 297 | 294 |
| Gower v. Tobitt , 39 W. R. 193 | 111 |
| Grace v. Bishop , 11 Ex. 424; 25 L. J. Ex. 58 | 87, 278 |
| Graham v. Ingleby , 1 Ex. 651; 5 D. & L. 737 | 546, 549 |
| — <i>v. Lewis</i> , 22 Q. B. D. 1; 58 L. J. Q. B. 117; 37 W. R. 73; 53 J. P. 166; 59 L. T. 35 | 91 |
| Grainger v. Gough , [1895] 1 Q. B. 71; 64 L. J. Q. B. 193; 71 L. T. 802; 43 W. R. 184 | 207 |
| Grant v. Anderson & Co. , [1892] 1 Q. B. 108; 61 L. J. Q. B. 107; 66 L. T. 79 | 204 |
| — <i>v. Ellis</i> , 9 M. & W. 113 | 229 |
| — <i>v. Kemp</i> , 2 Cr. & M. 636 | 316 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Graves, <i>In re</i> , L. R. 4 Q. B. 715 ; 20 L. T. 877 ; 17 W. R. 1018 . | 268 |
| — <i>v.</i> Ashford, L. R. 2 C. P. 410 ; 36 L. J. C. P. 139 ; 16 L. T. | |
| 98 ; 15 W. R. 498 . | 110, 382 |
| — <i>v.</i> Legg, 9 Ex. 642 ; 2 C. L. R. 1266 ; 23 L. J. Ex. 228 . | 31 |
| Gray <i>v.</i> Cookson, 16 East 13 . | 255, 292 |
| — <i>v.</i> Pullen, 5 B. & S. 970 ; 34 L. J. Q. B. 265 ; 11 L. T. 569 ; | |
| 13 W. R. 257 . | 507 |
| — <i>v.</i> R., 11 Cl. & F. 427 ; 8 Jur. 879 . | 494 |
| — <i>v.</i> Smith, 43 Ch. D. 208 ; 59 L. J. Ch. 145 ; 62 L. T. 335 ; | |
| 38 W. R. 310 . | 408 |
| Great Australian Co. <i>v.</i> Martin, 5 Ch. D. 1 ; 46 L. J. Ch. 289 ; | |
| 35 L. T. 874 ; 25 W. R. 246 . | 413 |
| Great Central Gas Co. <i>v.</i> Clarke, 13 C. B. N. S. 838 ; 32 L. J. | |
| C. P. 41 ; 11 W. R. 123 . | 253 |
| Great Charte <i>v.</i> Kennington, 2 Stra. 1173 . | 114 |
| Great Northern Joint Committee <i>v.</i> Inett, 2 Q. B. D. 284 ; 46 | |
| L. J. M. C. 237 ; 25 W. R. 584 . | 550 |
| Great Northern Steamship Co. <i>v.</i> Edgehill, 11 Q. B. D. 225 . | 581 |
| Great Western Ry. Co. <i>v.</i> Bailie, 5 B. & S. 928 ; 34 L. J. M. C. | |
| 31 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 264 ; 11 L. T. 418 ; 13 W. R. 203 . | 149 |
| — <i>v.</i> Bishop, L. R. 7 Q. B. 550 ; 41 L. J. M. C. 120 ; 26 L. T. | |
| 905 ; 20 W. R. 969 . | 378 |
| — <i>v.</i> R., 1 E. & B. 874 ; 16 Jur. 675 . | 344 |
| — <i>v.</i> Rly. Commrs., 7 Q. B. D. 182 ; 50 L. J. Q. B. 483 ; 45 | |
| L. T. 206 ; 29 W. R. 901 ; 56 J. P. 35 . | 415 |
| — <i>v.</i> Swindon and Cheltenham Ry., 9 App. Cas. 809 ; 53 L. J. | |
| Ch. 1075 ; 51 L. T. 798 ; 32 W. R. 957 ; 48 J. P. 820 . | 228 |
| Greathead <i>v.</i> Morley, 3 M. & G. 139 ; 3 Scott N. R. 538 . | 436 |
| Greaves <i>v.</i> Tofield, 14 Ch. D. 563 ; 43 L. T. 100 ; 28 W. R. 840 . | 433 |
| Green <i>v.</i> Gray, 1 Dowl. P. C. 350 . | 294 |
| — <i>v.</i> Jenkins, 1 De G. F. & J. 454 ; 28 Beav. 87 ; 29 L. J. | |
| Ch. 505 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 515 ; 8 W. R. 380 . | 242, 524 |
| — <i>v.</i> R., 1 App. Cas. 513 ; 35 L. T. 495 . | 226, 254, 400 |
| — <i>v.</i> Wood, 7 Q. B. 178 ; 9 Jur. 756 ; 14 L. J. Q. B. 217 . | 26, 354 |
| Greenaway <i>v.</i> Hurd, 4 T. R. 553 . | 325 |
| Greener, <i>Ex parte</i> , 15 Ch. D. 457 ; 43 L. T. 184 ; 28 W. R. 899 . | 551 |
| Greenhow <i>v.</i> Parker, 6 H. & N. 882 ; 31 L. J. Ex. 4 ; 4 L. T. | |
| 473 ; 9 W. R. 578 . | 393 |
| Greenwood, <i>Ex parte</i> , 27 L. J. Q. B. 28 ; 8 E. & B. 605 . | 329 |
| — <i>v.</i> Greenwood, 5 Ch. D. 954 ; 47 L. J. Ch. 298 ; 37 L. T. | |
| 712 ; 26 W. R. 5 . | 351 |
| — <i>v.</i> Hammersley, 5 Taunt. 727 . | 566 |
| Gregory's Case, 6 Rep. 19 b . | 243 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lv

| | PAGE |
|---|----------------|
| Gregson v. Potter, 4 Ex. D. 142 ; 48 L. J. M. C. 86 ; 27 W. R. 840 | 522 |
| Greig v. Bendeno, E. B. & E. 133 ; 27 L. J. M. C. 294 | 62, 377 |
| Grenfell v. Inland Rev. Com., 1 Ex. D. 242 ; 45 L. J. Ex. 465 ; 34 L. T. 426 ; 24 W. R. 582 | 206 |
| Grey v. Pearson, 6 H. L. 106 | 3 |
| Grievies v. Case, 4 Bro. C. C. 67 | 39 |
| Griffith v. Taylor, 2 C. P. D. 194 ; 46 L. J. C. P. 15 ; 36 L. T. 5 ; 25 W. R. 196 | 326, 487, 488 |
| Griffiths, <i>Ex parte</i> , 23 Ch. D. 69 ; 52 L. J. Ch. 717 ; 48 L. T. 450 ; 31 W. R. 878 | 163 |
| Grill v. Screw Collier Ry. Co., L. R. 1 C. P. 600 ; 35 L. J. C. P. 321 ; 17 Jur. N. S. 727 ; 14 L. T. 711 ; 14 W. R. 893 | 49, 151 |
| Grimes, <i>Ex parte</i> , 23 L. J. M. C. 153 ; 2 E. & B. 546 ; 17 Jur. 554 | 96 |
| Grimwade, <i>Ex parte</i> , 17 Q. B. D. 357 ; 55 L. J. Q. B. 495 ; 3 M. B. R. 166 | 76 |
| Grindley v. Barker, 1 Bos. & P. 229 ; 4 R. R. 787 | 517 |
| Grizewood v. Blane, 11 C. B. 538 | 159 |
| Grocers' Co. v. Donne, 3 Bing. N. C. 34 ; 3 Scott 356 ; 2 Hodges 120 | 505 |
| Guldfaxe, The, L. R. 2 Ad. & Ec. 325 ; 19 L. T. 748 ; 38 L. J. Adm. 12 | 211 |
| Gully v. Smith, 12 Q. B. D. 121 ; 53 L. J. M. C. 35 ; 48 J. P. 309 | 388 |
| Gunnestad v. Price, L. R. 10 Ex. 65 ; 44 L. J. Ex. 44 ; 32 L. T. 492 ; 23 W. R. 470 | 25, 186 |
| Guthrie v. Fisk, 3 B. & C. 178 ; 3 Stark. 153 ; 5 D. & R. 24 | 499 |
| Guy v. Matthews, 4 B. & S. 425 ; 9 Jur. 716 ; 8 L. T. 674 ; 11 W. R. 922 | 241 |
| Gwyn v. Hardwicke, 1 H. & N. 49 ; 25 L. J. M. C. 97 | 425 |
| Gwynne v. Burnell, 6 Bing. N. C. 453 ; 2 Scott N. R. 711 ; 1 West 342 ; 7 C. & F. 572 | 4, 7, 358, 531 |
| — v. Drewitt, [1894] 2 Ch. 616 ; 63 L. J. Ch. 870 ; 71 L. T. 190 | 589 |
| Gye v. Felton, 4 Taunt. 876 | 297 |

H.

| | |
|---|----------|
| Habergham v. Vincent, 1 Ves. Jun. 68, 410 ; 2 Ves. Jun. 204 ; 5 T. R. 92 | 548 |
| Hack v. London Prov. Bldg. Socy., 23 Ch. D. 111 ; 52 L. J. Ch. 542 ; 48 L. T. 250 ; 31 W. R. 393 | 124, 181 |
| Hacking v. Lee, 2 E. & E. 906 ; 29 L. J. Q. B. 204 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 952 ; 8 W. R. 495 | 417 |
| Hadden v. The Collector, 5 Wall. 110 | 57 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Hadfield's Case , L. R. 8 C. P. 306 ; 42 L. J. C. P. 146 ; 28 L. T. 901 ; 21 W. R. 637 | 47 |
| Hadley v. Perks , L. R. 1 Q. B. 444 ; 35 L. J. M. C. 177 ; 12 Jur. N. S. 662 ; 14 L. T. 325 ; 14 W. R. 730 ; 6 B. & S. 375 | 453, 467 |
| Haggin v. Comptoir d'Escompte , 23 Q. B. D. 519 ; 58 L. J. Q. B. 508 ; 37 W. R. 703 | 92 |
| Haigh v. Kaye , L. R. 7 Ch. 469 ; 41 L. J. Ch. 567 ; 26 L. T. 675 ; 20 W. R. 597 | 360 |
| — v. Sheffield , L. R. 10 Q. B. 102 ; 44 L. J. M. C. 17 ; 31 L. T. 536 ; 23 W. R. 547 | 394 |
| Haldane v. Beauchlerk , 6 D. & L. 642 ; 3 Ex. 658 ; 18 L. J. Ex. 227 ; 13 Jur. 326 | 454 |
| Hall v. Bristol , L. R. 2 C. P. 322 ; 36 L. J. C. P. 110 ; 15 L. T. 572 ; 15 W. R. 404 | 131 |
| — v. Knox , 4 B. & S. 515 ; 33 L. J. M. C. 1 ; 9 L. T. 380 ; 12 W. R. 103 | 331 |
| — v. Maule , 4 A. & E. 283 ; 5 N. & M. 455 | 190 |
| — v. Nixon , L. R. 10 Q. B. 152 ; 44 L. J. M. C. 51 ; 32 L. T. 87 ; 23 W. R. 612 | 417, 501, 567 |
| — v. Pritchett , 3 Q. B. D. 215 ; 47 L. J. Q. B. 15 ; 37 L. T. 671 ; 26 W. R. 95 | 78 |
| — v. Wright , E. B. & E. 746 ; 29 L. J. Q. B. 43 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 193 ; 8 W. R. 160 | 541 |
| Hall Dare v. Hall Dare , 31 Ch. D. 251 ; 55 L. J. Ch. 154 ; 54 L. T. 120 ; 34 W. R. 82 | 122 |
| Halsey v. Hales , 7 T. R. 194 | 82 |
| Halton v. Cove , 1 B. & A. 538 | 59 |
| Hamilton v. Baker , 14 App. Cas. 209 ; 58 L. J. P. 57 ; 61 L. T. 26 ; 38 W. R. 129 ; 6 Asp. M. C. 413 | 429 |
| — v. Dallas , 1 Ch. D. 257 ; 45 L. J. Ch. 15 ; 33 L. T. 495 ; 24 W. R. 264 | 207 |
| Hammersmith Ry. Co. v. Brand , L. R. 4 H. L. 171 ; 18 W. R. 12 ; 21 L. T. 238 ; 38 L. J. Q. B. 265 | 71, 503 |
| Hammersmith Rent Charge, Re , 4 Ex. 87 ; 19 L. J. Ex. 66 | 514, 516 |
| Hammond v. Pulsford , [1895] 1 Q. B. 223 ; 64 L. J. M. C. 63 ; 71 L. T. 767 ; 43 W. R. 236 | 499 |
| Hampden v. Walsh , 1 Q. B. D. 189 ; 45 L. J. Q. B. 238 ; 33 L. T. 852 ; 24 W. R. 607 | 151 |
| Hampton v. Rickard , 43 L. J. M. C. 133 ; 30 L. T. 636 | 211 |
| Hance v. Harding , 20 Q. B. D. 732 ; 57 L. J. Q. B. 403 ; 59 L. T. 659 ; 36 W. R. 629 | 79 |
| Hancocks v. Lablache , 3 C. P. D. 197 ; 47 L. J. C. P. 514 ; 38 L. T. 753 ; 26 W. R. 402 | 22, 352 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lviii

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Haney's Trusts, Re , L. R. 10 Ch. 275 ; 23 W. R. 662 | 212 |
| Hanfstaengl v. Empire Palace , [1894] 2 Ch. 1; 63 L. J. Ch. 417; 70 L. T. 459; 42 W. R. 454 | 45, 110 |
| — <i>v. Newnes</i> , [1894] 3 Ch. 109; 63 L. J. Ch. 681; 70 L. T. 854; 42 W. R. 681 | 110 |
| Hanmer v. Chance , 34 L. J. Ch. 413; 4 De G. J. & S. 626 | 125 |
| Hann, Re , 18 Q. B. D. 393; 56 L. J. Q. B. 161; 55 L. T. 820; 35 W. R. 370; 4 M. B. R. | 414 |
| Harben v. Phillips , 23 Ch. D. 14; 48 L. T. 334; 31 W. R. 173 | 525 |
| Harbert's Case , 3 Rep. 13 b | 113, 243 |
| Hardcastle v. Bielby , [1892] 1 Q. B. 709; 61 L. J. M. C. 101; 66 L. T. 343; 56 J. P. 549 | 144 |
| Harden v. Hesketh , 4 H. & N. 175 | 229 |
| Harding v. Headington , L. R. 9 Q. B. 157; 43 L. J. M. C. 59; 29 L. T. 833; 22 W. R. 262 | 168 |
| Hardy v. Bern , 5 T. R. 540, 636 | 226 |
| — <i>v. Fothergill</i> , 13 App. Cas. 351; 58 L. J. Q. B. 44; 59 L. T. 659; 36 W. R. 629 | 79 |
| — <i>v. Ryle</i> , 9 B. & C. 603; 4 M. & R. 295 | 490 |
| Hardy's Case , 24 State Trials 200 | 440 |
| Hardyman v. Whitaker , 2 East 573 n. | 275 |
| Harford's Trusts , 13 Ch. D. 135; 28 W. R. 238; 41 L. T. 382 | 416 |
| Hargreaves v. Diddams , L. R. 10 Q. B. 582; 44 L. J. M. C. 178; 32 L. T. 600; 23 W. R. 828 | 147 |
| Harlock v. Ashberry , 19 Ch. D. 84; 51 L. J. Ch. 96; 45 L. T. 602; 30 W. R. 112 | 166 |
| Harper v. Carr , 7 T. R. 270, 448; 4 R. R. 440 | 513 |
| — <i>v. Taswell</i> , 6 C. & P. 166 | 356 |
| Harrington v. Ramsay , 8 Ex. 879; 22 L. J. Ex. 326; 2 E. & B. 669; 22 L. J. Q. B. 460 | 334 |
| Harris v. Birch , 9 M. & W. 594; 1 D. N. S. 899 | 401 |
| — <i>v. Boston</i> , 2 Camp. 348 | 159 |
| — <i>v. Franconia</i> , 2 C. P. D. 173; 46 L. J. C. P. 363 | 202 |
| — <i>v. Jenne</i> , 9 C. B. N. S. 152; 30 L. J. M. C. 183; 3 L. T. 408; 9 W. R. 36 | 227, 477 |
| Harrison, Ex parte , 13 Q. B. D. 753; 53 L. J. Ch. 977; 51 L. T. 878 | 76 |
| —, 2 De G. & J. 229 | 542 |
| — <i>v. Blackburn</i> , 17 C. B. N. S. 678; 34 L. J. C. P. 109; 10 Jur. N. S. 1131; 11 L. T. 453; 13 W. R. 135 | 472 |
| — <i>v. Carter</i> , 2 C. P. D. 26; 46 L. J. C. P. 57; 35 L. T. 511; 25 W. R. 182; 2 Hop. & C. 324 | 463 |
| — <i>v. London and Brighton Ry. Co.</i> , 2 B. & S. 122; 31 L. J. Q. B. 113; 8 Jur. 740 | 328 |

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------------|
| Harrison v. Rutland, Duke of , [1893] 1 Q. B. 142; 62 L. J. Q. B. 117; 68 L. T. 35; 41 W. R. 322; 57 J. P. 278 | 390 |
| — <i>v. Stickney</i> , 2 H. L. 108 | 284 |
| Harrison's Case , 1 Leach 180 | 460 |
| Harrod v. Worship , 1 B. & S. 381; 8 Jur. 153; 9 W. R. 865 | 400 |
| Hart v. Herwig , L. R. 8 Ch. 860 | 206 |
| Hartley v. Hooker , 2 Cowp. 524 | 494 |
| Hartnall v. Ryde Commissioners , 4 B. & S. 361; 33 L. J. Q. B. 39; 10 Jur. N. S. 257; 11 W. R. 763 | 584 |
| Harvey v. Archbold , 3 D. & C. 626; 5 D. & R. 500; R. & M. 184 | 159 |
| Hasker v. Wood , 54 L. J. Q. B. 419; 33 W. R. 697 | 244 |
| Hasluck v. Pedley , L. R. 19 Eq. 271; 44 L. J. Ch. 143; 23 W. R. 155 | 300 |
| Hastings, Re , 6 Ch. D. 610; 47 L. J. Ch. 137; 25 W. R. 842 | 233 |
| Hattersley v. Burr , 4 H. & C. 523; 12 Jur. 894; 14 L. T. 565; 14 W. R. 864 | 417 |
| Hawe v. Planner , 1 Saund. 10 | 500 |
| Hawes v. Paveley , 1 C. P. D. 418; 46 L. J. C. P. 18; 34 L. T. 835; 24 W. R. 895 | 180 |
| Hawkins v. Gathercole , 1 Jur. N. S. 481; 6 De G. M. & G. 1; 24 L. J. Ex. 338 | 30, 229, 243 |
| — <i>v. Rutter</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 668; 61 L. J. Q. B. 146; 40 W. R. 238 | 98 |
| — <i>v. Walrond</i> , 1 C. P. D. 280; 45 L. J. C. P. 772; 35 L. T. 210; 24 W. R. 824 | 231 |
| Hawthorne, Re , 23 Ch. D. 743; 52 L. J. Ch. 750; 58 L. T. 701; 32 W. R. 147 | 205 |
| Hawtry v. Butlin , L. R. 8 Q. B. 290; 42 L. J. Q. B. 163; 28 L. T. 532; 21 W. R. 633 | 132 |
| Hay v. Tower JJ. , 24 Q. B. D. 561; 59 L. J. M. C. 79; 62 L. T. 290; 13 W. R. 414; 54 J. P. 500 | 310 |
| Hayes v. Stephenson , 3 L. T. N. S. 296; 9 W. R. 53 | 377 |
| Hayman v. Flewker , 13 C. B. N. S. 526; 32 L. J. C. P. 132; 9 Jur. N. S. 895 | 70 |
| Hayward v. E. London Waterworks , 28 Ch. D. 138; 54 L. J. Ch. 523; 52 L. T. 175 | 570 |
| — <i>v. Giffard</i> , 4 M. & W. 194; 6 D. P. C. 699 | 407 |
| Hearne v. Garton , 2 El. & El. 66; 28 L. J. M. C. 16; 5 Jur. N. S. 648; 33 L. T. 256 | 140 |
| Heath v. Heap , 26 L. J. M. C. 49; 1 H. & N. 478 | 374 |
| Heawood v. Bone , 13 Q. B. D. 179; 51 L. T. 125; 32 W. R. 752; 48 J. P. 710 | 93 |
| Hebbert v. Purchas , L. R. 3 P. C. 605; 40 L. J. Ec. 33; 19 W. R. 898; 7 Moo. P. C. N. S. 468 | 37, 427, 428, 592 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lix

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Hecquard, Re</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 71 ; 38 W. R. 148 ; 6 M. B. R. 282 . | 54 |
| <i>Hedworth v. Jackson</i> , Hard. 318 . | 318 |
| <i>Heelis v. Brown</i> , 18 C. B. N. S. 90 ; 34 L. J. C. P. 88 . | 47 |
| <i>Heinemann v. Halle</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 83 ; 60 L. J. Q. B. 650 ; 64 L. T. 548 ; 39 W. R. 485 . | 204 |
| <i>Hemstead v. Phoenix Gas Co.</i> , 3 H. & C. 745 ; 34 L. J. Ex. 108 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 626 ; 13 W. R. 662 ; 12 L. T. 313 . | 38 |
| <i>Henderson, Re</i> , 20 Q. B. D. 509 ; 57 L. J. Q. B. 258 ; 58 L. T. 835 ; 36 W. R. 567 ; 5 M. B. R. 52 . | 76 |
| — <i>v. Bise</i> , 3 Stark. 158 . | 380, 381 |
| — <i>v. Maxwell</i> , 4 Ch. D. 163 ; 46 L. J. Ch. 59 ; 25 W. R. 66 . | 522 |
| — <i>v. Royal British Bank</i> , 7 E. & B. 356 ; 1 H. & N. 685 n. ; 26 L. J. Q. B. 112 ; 3 Jur. N. S. 111 . | 536 |
| — <i>v. Sherborne</i> , 2 M. & W. 236 . | 258, 370, 398 |
| <i>Henley, Re</i> , 9 Ch. D. 469 ; 39 L. T. 53 ; 26 W. R. 885 . | 190 |
| <i>Henrette v. Booth</i> , 15 C. B. N. S. 500 ; 33 L. J. C. P. 61 ; 9 Jur. N. S. 1293 ; 9 L. T. 392 ; 12 W. R. 173 . | 54 |
| <i>Henry v. Newcastle Trinity H.</i> , 8 E. & B. 723 ; 27 L. J. M. C. 57 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 685 . | 11 |
| <i>Herbert v. Sayer</i> , 5 Q. B. 965 ; 2 D. & L. 49 ; 13 L. J. Q. B. 209 ; 8 Jur. 812 . | 52, 271 |
| <i>Hermann v. Seneschal</i> , 13 C. B. N. S. 392 ; 32 L. J. C. P. 43 ; 6 L. T. 646 ; 11 W. R. 184 . | 325 |
| <i>Herron v. Rathmines Commissioners</i> , [1892] A. C. 498 . | 419 |
| <i>Herschfield v. Clarke</i> , 11 Ex. 712 ; 25 L. J. Ex. 113 ; 2 Jur. N. S. 239 . | 107 |
| <i>Hertford Union v. Kimpton</i> , 11 Ex. 255 ; 25 L. J. M. C. 41 . | 183 |
| <i>Heseltine v. Siggers</i> , 1 Ex. 856 ; 18 L. J. Ex. 166 . | 462 |
| <i>Hesketh v. Atherton</i> , L. R. 9 Q. B. 4 ; 43 L. J. M. C. 37 ; 29 L. T. 530 . | 515 |
| <i>Hewer v. Cox</i> , 30 L. J. Q. B. 73 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 1339 ; 9 W. R. 143 ; 3 L. T. N. S. 508 . | 91 |
| <i>Hewitt's Estate</i> , 6 W. R. 537 . | 205 |
| — <i>v. Price</i> , 4 M. & G. 355 ; 3 Railw. Cas. 175 ; 5 Scott N. R. 229 . | 381 |
| <i>Hewlett v. Allen</i> , [1894] App. Cas. 383 ; 63 L. J. Q. B. 608 ; 71 L. T. 94 ; 42 W. R. 670 ; 58 J. P. 700 . | 104 |
| <i>Heydon's Case</i> , 3 Rep. 7 b ; 10 Rep. 73 a . | 29, 95, 385 |
| <i>Hicks, Ex parte</i> , L. R. 20 Eq. 143 ; 44 L. J. Bkcy. 106 ; 32 L. T. 432 ; 23 W. R. 852 . | 490 |
| <i>Hickson v. Darlow</i> , 23 Ch. D. 690 ; 48 L. T. 449 ; 31 W. R. 417 . | 301 |
| <i>Hider v. Donell</i> , 1 Taunt. 383 . | 102 |
| <i>Higginson v. Simpson</i> , 2 C. P. D. 76 ; 46 L. J. C. P. 192 ; 36 L. T. 17 ; 25 W. R. 303 . | 159 |

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Higgs v. Schroeder, 3 C. P. D. 252 ; 47 L. J. Q. B. 426 ; 26 W. R. 831 | 19 |
| Hill, <i>Ex parte</i> , 6 Ch. D. 63 ; 46 L. J. Bkcy. 116 ; 37 L. T. 46 ; 25 W. R. 784 | 76 |
| —, 3 C. & P. 225 | 483 |
| — v. Crook, L. R. 6 H. L. 283 ; 22 W. R. 137 | 31, 82 |
| — v. Hall, 1 Ex. D. 411 ; 45 L. J. M. C. 153 ; 35 L. T. 860 | 236 |
| — v. London & Co. Ins. Co., 1 H. & N. 398 ; 26 L. J. Ex. 89 | 347 |
| — v. West India Dock Co., 9 App. Cas. 456 ; 53 L. J. Ch. 842 ; 51 L. T. 163 ; 32 W. R. 925 ; 48 J. P. 788 | 278 |
| Hilliard v. Lenard, M. & M. 297 | 311 |
| Hillman, <i>Ex parte</i> , 10 Ch. D. 622 ; 48 L. J. Bkcy. 77 ; 40 L. T. 177 ; 27 W. R. 567 | 79 |
| Hills v. Shepherd, 1 F. & F. 191 | 150 |
| Hinde v. Chorlton, L. R. 2 C. P. 104 ; 36 L. J. C. P. 79 ; 12 Jur. N. S. 1008 ; 15 L. T. 472 ; 15 W. R. 226 | 129 |
| Hinton v. Dibben, 2 Q. B. 646 ; 2 G. & D. 36 ; 6 Jur. 601 | 16, 58 |
| Hipkins v. Birmingham Gas Co., 6 H. & N. 250 ; 30 L. J. Ex. 60 ; 7 Jur. N. S. 213 ; 9 W. R. 168 | 143, 420 |
| Hirst v. Molesbury, L. R. 6 Q. B. 130 ; 40 L. J. M. C. 76 ; 23 L. T. 55 ; 19 W. R. 246 | 472 |
| Hitchcock v. Way, 6 A. & E. 943 ; 2 N. & P. 72 ; W. W. & D. 491 | 310, 589 |
| Hobbs v. Henning, 17 C. B. N. S. 791 ; 34 L. J. C. P. 117 | 559 |
| Hobson v. Neale, 8 Ex. 131 ; 22 L. J. Ex. 175 ; 16 Jur. 1023 | 317, 587 |
| Hodgkinson v. Wyatt, 4 Q. B. 749 ; 13 L. J. Q. B. 54 | 589 |
| Hodgson v. Bell, 24 Q. B. D. 525 ; 59 L. J. Q. B. 231 ; 62 L. T. 481 ; 38 W. R. 325 | 223 |
| — v. Carlisle, 8 E. & B. 116 | 188 |
| — v. Jex, 2 Ch. D. 122 | 474 |
| — v. Temple, 5 Taunt. 181 ; 1 Marsh 5 ; 14 R. R. 738 | 563 |
| — v. —, 5 Taunt. 503 ; 1 Marsh 166 ; 15 R. R. 567 | 559 |
| Hodsden v. Harridge, 2 Wms. Saund. 64 a | 360 |
| Hodson v. Sharpe, 10 East 350 ; 10 R. R. 324 | 150, 297 |
| Holborn Union v. St. Leonards, Shoreditch, 2 Q. B. D. 145 ; 46 L. J. Q. B. 36 ; 35 L. T. 400 ; 25 W. R. 40 | 575 |
| Holgate v. Slight, 2 L. M. & P. 662 ; 21 L. J. Q. B. 74 | 534 |
| Holland, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 9 Ch. 307 ; 43 L. J. Bkcy. 85 ; 30 L. T. 106 ; 22 W. R. 425 | 498 |
| Hollingsworth v. Palmer, 4 Ex. 281 ; 18 L. J. Ex. 409 | 27, 319 |
| Hollis v. Marshall, 2 H. & N. 755 | 268 |
| Holman v. Johnson, 1 Cowp. 341 | 559 |
| Holme v. Guy, 5 Ch. D. 901 ; 46 L. J. Ch. 648 ; 36 L. T. 600 ; 25 W. R. 547 | 35 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxi

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Holmes v. Clarke, 6 H. & N. 349; 30 L. J. Ex. 135; 7 Jur. N. S. 397; 3 L. T. 675; 9 W. R. 419 & 9 L. T. 198 . . . | 579 |
| — v. Service, 15 C. B. 293; 28 L. J. C. P. 24; 1 Jur. N. S. 258 . . . | 20 |
| Holt v. Collyer, 16 Ch. D. 718; 50 L. J. Ch. 311; 44 L. T. 214; 29 W. R. 502 . . . | 83 |
| Honeybone v. Hambridge, 18 Q. B. D. 418; 56 L. J. Q. B. 46; 56 L. T. 365; 35 W. R. 520; 51 J. P. 103; 1 Fox 26 . . . | 99 |
| Hope v. Hope, 4 De G. M. & G. 328; 23 L. J. Ch. 682 . . . | 413 |
| Hopkins v. Crowe, 4 A. & E. 774; 7 C. & P. 373; 2 H. & W. 21 . . . | 325 |
| — v. G. N. Ry. Co., 2 Q. B. D. 224; 46 L. J. Q. B. 265; 36 L. T. 898 . . . | 131 |
| — v. Smethwick Local Bd., 24 Q. B. D. 712; 59 L. J. Q. B. 250; 62 L. T. 783; 38 W. R. 499; 54 J. P. 693 . . . | 513 |
| Hopper, Re, L. R. 2 Q. B. 367; 8 B. & S. 100; 36 L. J. Q. B. 97; 15 L. T. 566; 15 W. R. 443 . . . | 517 |
| Hopton v. Thirlwall, 9 L. T. 327; 12 W. R. 72 . . . | 141 |
| Horn v. Ion, 4 B. & A. 78; 1 N. & M. 627 . . . | 457 |
| Hornsby v. Raggett, [1892] 1 Q. B. 20; 61 L. J. M. C. 24; 66 L. T. 21; 40 W. R. 111; 56 J. P. 135; 17 Cox C. C. 428 . . . | 394 |
| Hornsey L. Bd. v. Monarch Building Society, 24 Q. B. D. 5; 29 L. J. Q. B. 105; 38 W. R. 85; 53 J. P. 774 . . . | 3, 289 |
| Horsfall v. Davy, 1 Stark. 169 . . . | 574 |
| Hough v. Windus, 12 Q. B. D. 224; 53 L. J. Q. B. 165; 50 L. T. 312; 32 W. R. 452; 1 M. B. R. 1 . . . | 306, 399, 445 |
| Howard v. Bodington, 2 P. D. 203 . . . | 520, 528 |
| Howe v. Synge, 15 East 540 . . . | 566 |
| Howell v. Coupland, 1 Q. B. D. 258; 46 L. J. Q. B. 147; 33 L. T. 832; 24 W. R. 470 . . . | 541 |
| — v. London Dock Co., 8 E. & B. 212; 27 L. J. M. C. 177; 4 Jur. N. S. 205 . . . | 338 |
| Howes v. Inland Revenue Bd., 1 Ex. D. 385; 46 L. J. M. C. 15; 35 L. T. 584; 24 W. R. 897 . . . | 462 |
| Howson, Doe d., v. Waterton, 3 B. & Ald. 149 . . . | 41 |
| Hoyland v. Bremner, 2 C. B. 84; 1 Lutw. Reg. Cas. 381; 15 L. J. C. P. 133; 10 Jur. 36 . . . | 125, 291 |
| Hoyle, Re, [1893] 1 Ch. 84; 62 L. J. Ch. 182; 67 L. T. 674; 41 W. R. 81 . . . | 409 |
| — v. Hitchman, 4 Q. B. D. 233; 48 L. J. M. C. 97; 40 L. T. 252; 27 W. R. 487. . . | 390 |
| Huber v. Steiner, 2 Bing. N. C. 202; 2 Scott 304; 1 Hodges 206 . . . | 213 |
| Hubert v. Treherne, 3 M. & G. 743 . . . | 53 |
| Huckle v. Wilson, 2 C. P. D. 410; 26 W. R. 98 . . . | 181 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Hudson v. Ede</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 412; 37 L. J. Q. B. 166; 18 L. T. 764; 16 W. R. 940; 8 B. & S. 640 | 32 |
| — <i>v. McRae</i> , 4 B. & S. 585; 33 L. J. M. C. 65; 12 W. R. 80 | 147 |
| — <i>v. Tooth</i> , 3 Q. B. D. 46; 47 L. J. Q. B. 18; 37 L. T. 462; 26 W. R. 95 | 38, 416 |
| <i>Hudston v. Midland Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 4 Q. B. 366; 38 L. J. Q. B. 213; 20 L. T. 526; 17 W. R. 705 | 453 |
| <i>Huffam v. N. Staffordshire Ry. Co.</i> , [1894] 2 Q. B. 821; 63 L. J. M. C. 225; 71 L. T. 517; 43 W. R. 28; 59 J. P. 23 | 417 |
| <i>Huggins v. Bainbridge, Willes</i> 241 | 188, 191 |
| <i>Hughes, Ex parte</i> , 23 L. J. M. C. 138; 2 C. L. R. 1542; 18 Jur. 447 | 469 |
| — <i>Re</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 595; 62 L. J. Q. B. 538; 68 L. T. 629; 41 W. R. 466; 10 M. B. R. 91 | 77 |
| — <i>v. Buckland</i> , 15 M. & W. 346; 3 D. & L. 702; 15 L. J. Ex. 233; 10 Jur. 884 | 324, 325 |
| — <i>v. Chatham</i> , 5 M. & Gr. 64; 7 Scott N. R. 581; 1 Lut. Reg. Cas. 51; 13 L. J. C. P. 44; 7 Jur. 1136 | 165 |
| — <i>v. Chester Ry. Co.</i> , 1 Dr. & Sm. 524; 3 De G. F. & J. 352; 8 Jur. 221; 31 L. J. Ch. 97; 7 L. T. 197; 9 W. R. 760 | 71 |
| — <i>v. Lumley</i> , 24 L. J. Q. B. 29; 4 E. & B. 358 | 317 |
| — <i>v. Morris</i> , 2 De G. M. & G. 349; 21 L. J. Ch. 761; 16 Jur. 603 | 361, 458 |
| — <i>v. Smallwood</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 306; 59 L. J. Q. B. 503; 63 L. T. 198 | 443 |
| <i>Hull Dock Co. v. Browne</i> , 2 B. & A. 59 | 398, 402, 420 |
| — <i>v. La Marche</i> , 8 B. & C. 42; 2 M. & R. 107 | 420 |
| <i>Humble v. Mitchell</i> , 11 A. & E. 205; 2 Rail. Cas. 70; 3 P. & D. 141 | 54, 462 |
| <i>Humfrey v. Gery</i> , 7 C. B. 567 | 233 |
| <i>Humphreys v. Green</i> , 10 Q. B. D. 148; 52 L. J. Q. B. 140; 48 L. T. 60; 47 J. P. 244 | 361 |
| <i>Hungerford Market Co. v. City Steam B. Co.</i> , 3 E. & E. 365; 30 L. J. Q. B. 25; 7 Jur. N. S. 67; 3 L. T. 732 | 545 |
| <i>Hunt v. G. Northern Ry. Co.</i> , 10 C. B. 900; 2 L. M. & P. 268; 20 L. J. C. P. 349; 15 Jur. 400 | 228 |
| — <i>v. Hibbs</i> , 5 H. & N. 123; 29 L. J. Ex. 222; 6 Jur. N. S. 78; 2 L. T. 379; 8 W. R. 238 | 529 |
| — <i>v. Wimbledon Loc. Bd.</i> , 4 C. P. D. 48; 48 L. J. C. P. 207; 39 L. T. 35; 27 W. R. 123 | 539 |
| <i>Hunter v. Gibbons</i> , 1 H. & N. 459; 26 L. J. Ex. 1; 5 W. R. 91; 10 Jur. N. S. 1249 | 8 |
| — <i>v. Nockolds</i> , 1 Mac. & G. 640; 1 H. & T. 644; 14 Jur. 256; 19 L. J. Ch. 177 | 57, 233 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxiii

| | PAGE |
|--|--------------|
| <i>Hunter v. Potts</i> , 4 T. R. 182 ; 2 H. Bl. 403 ; 2 R. R. 353 . | 205 |
| <i>Hurlbatt v. Barnett</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 77 ; 62 L. J. Q. B. 1 ; 67 L. T. 818 ; 41 W. R. 33 . | 449 |
| <i>Hussey's Case</i> , 9 Rep. 73 . | 116 |
| <i>Hussey v. Horne Payne</i> , 4 App. Cas. 311 ; 48 L. J. Ch. 846 ; 41 L. T. 1 ; 27 W. R. 585 . | 408 |
| <i>Hutchins v. Player</i> , Bridg. 272 . | 243, 249 |
| <i>Hutchinson, Re</i> , 16 Q. B. D. 521 ; 55 L. J. Q. B. 582 ; 34 W. R. 475 . | 23 |
| — <i>v. Gillespie</i> , 11 Ex. 798 ; 25 L. J. Ex. 103 ; 2 Jur. N. S. 403 . | 572 |
| — <i>v. Greenwood</i> , 4 E. & B. 324 ; 3 C. L. R. 115 ; 24 L. J. Q. B. 2 ; 1 Jur. N. S. 329 . | 406 |
| <i>Huxham v. Wheeler</i> , 3 H. & C. 75 ; 33 L. J. M. C. 153 ; 10 Jur. N. S. 545 ; 10 L. T. 342 ; 12 W. R. 713 . | 249 |
| <i>Hyde v. Johnson</i> , 2 Bing. N. C. 776 ; 3 Scott 289 ; 2 Hodges 94 . | 53, 104, 450 |

I.

| | |
|--|------------------|
| <i>Iles v. West Ham Union</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 69 ; 51 L. J. Q. B. 17 ; 46 L. T. 149 ; 30 W. R. 303 ; 46 J. P. 660 & 8 App. Cas. 386 ; 52 L. J. Q. B. 650 ; 49 L. T. 205 ; 31 W. R. 928 ; 47 J. P. 708 . | 272 |
| <i>Imperial Gas Co. v. London Gas Co.</i> , 10 Ex. 39 ; 2 C. L. R. 1230 ; 23 L. J. Ex. 303 ; 18 Jur. 497 . | 8 |
| <i>Income Tax Commrs. v. Pemsel</i> , [1891] App. Cas. 531 ; 55 J. P. 805 . | 83, 355, 434 |
| <i>India, The</i> , 33 L. J. Adm. 193 ; 1 B. & L. 221 ; 12 L. T. 316 . | 213, 227, 592 |
| <i>Indian Chief, The</i> , 3 C. Rob. 12 . | 85, 194 |
| <i>Industry, The</i> , 1 Gallison 114 . | 263, 398, 399 |
| <i>Ingate v. Austrian Lloyds</i> , 4 C. B. N. S. 704 ; 27 L. J. C. P. 323 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 975 . | 460 |
| <i>Inglis v. Grant</i> , 5 T. R. 530 . | 196 |
| <i>Ings v. London & S. W. Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 4 C. P. 17 ; 38 L. J. C. P. 86 ; 17 W. R. 120 . | 312 |
| <i>Inland Revenue Commrs. v. Angus</i> , 23 Q. B. D. 579 ; 38 W. R. 3 . | 402 |
| — <i>v. Forrest</i> , 15 App. Cas. 334 ; 63 L. T. 36 ; 39 W. R. 33 ; 54 J. P. 772 . | 405 |
| — <i>v. Scott</i> , [1892] 2 Q. B. 152 ; 61 L. J. Q. B. 432 ; 67 L. T. 173 ; 40 W. R. 632 ; 56 J. P. 580, 632 . | 434 |
| <i>Institute of Patent Agents v. Lockwood</i> , [1894] App. Cas. 347 ; 63 L. J. P. C. 74 ; 71 L. T. 205 . | 50, 72, 217, 419 |
| <i>Internat. Pulp, etc., Co.</i> , 3 Ch. D. 594 ; 45 L. J. Ch. 446 ; 35 L. T. 229 ; 24 W. R. 535 . | 205 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| <i>Iona, The</i> , L. R. 1 P. C. 426 ; 4 Moo. P. C. C. N. S. 336 ; 16 L. T. 158 | 412 |
| <i>Ionides v. The Pacific Insurance Co.</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 517 ; 41 L. J. Q. B. 190 ; 26 L. T. 738 ; 21 W. R. 22 | 155 |
| <i>Irish Land Commrs. v. Grant</i> , 10 App. Cas. 14 ; 52 L. T. 228 ; 33 W. R. 357 | 229 |
| <i>Irish Peat Co. v. Phillips</i> , 1 B. & S. 598 ; 30 L. J. Q. B. 363 ; 7 Jur. N. S. 1189 ; 4 L. T. 806 ; 9 W. R. 873 | 525 |
| <i>Ironsides, The</i> , Lush. 458 ; 31 L. J. Adm. 129 ; 6 L. T. 59. | 315 |
| <i>Irresistible, The</i> , 7 Wheat. 551 | 589 |
| <i>Isaacson, Re</i> , [1895] 1 Q. B. 333 ; 64 L. J. Q. B. 191 ; 71 L. T. 812 ; 43 W. R. 278 | 566 |
| <i>Isberwood v. Oldknow</i> , 3 M. & S. 382. | 430 |
| <i>Isitt v. Beeston</i> , L. R. 4 Ex. 159 ; 38 L. J. Ex. 89 ; 20 L. T. 371 ; 17 W. R. 620 | 463 |
| <i>Iveson v. Moore</i> , 1 Salk. 15 | 581 |

J.

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| <i>Jackson v. Beaumont</i> , 11 Ex. 300 ; 24 L. J. Ex. 301 | 550 |
| — <i>v. Burnham</i> , 8 Ex. 173 ; 23 L. J. Ex. 63 | 52, 271 |
| — <i>v. Spittall</i> , L. R. 5 C. P. 542 ; 39 L. J. C. P. 321 ; 22 L. T. 755 ; 18 W. R. 1162 | 212 |
| — <i>v. Woolley</i> , 8 E. & B. 778 ; 27 L. J. Q. B. 448 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 656 | 306 |
| <i>Jacobs v. Brett</i> , L. R. 20 Eq. 1 ; 44 L. J. Ch. 377 ; 32 L. T. 522 ; 23 W. R. 556 | 178, 179, 180 |
| — <i>v. Crédit Lyonnais</i> , 12 Q. B. D. 589 ; 53 L. J. Q. B. 156 ; 50 L. T. 194 ; 32 W. R. 761 | 212, 541 |
| <i>James v. L. & S. W. Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 7 Ex. 287 ; 27 L. T. 382 ; 41 L. J. Ex. 82 ; 20 W. R. 238 | 184, 544 |
| <i>Jameson v. Brick Co.</i> , 4 Q. B. D. 208 ; 48 L. J. Q. B. 249 ; 39 L. T. 594 ; 27 W. R. 221 | 271 |
| <i>Jaques v. Withy</i> , 1 H. Bl. 65 | 589 |
| <i>Jarman, Ex parte</i> , 4 Ch. D. 835 ; 46 L. J. Ch. 485 | 454 |
| <i>Jay v. Johnstone</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 189 ; 62 L. J. Q. B. 128 ; 68 L. T. 129 ; 41 W. R. 161 ; 57 J. P. 309 | 433 |
| <i>Jeffreys v. Boosey</i> , 4 H. L. Cas. 815 ; 3 C. L. R. 625 ; 24 L. J. Ex. 81 ; 1 Jur. N. S. 615 | 3, 57, 209, 210, 223 |
| — <i>v. Evans</i> , 19 C. B. N. S. 264 ; 34 L. J. C. P. 261 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 585 ; 13 L. T. 72 ; 13 W. R. 864 | 468 |
| — <i>v. Gurr</i> , 2 B. & A. 833 | 494 |
| <i>Jeffries v. Alexander</i> , 31 L. J. Ch. 148 ; 8 H. L. 594 ; 7 Jur. N. S. 221 ; 2 L. T. 768 | 157, 159, 164, 170 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxv

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Jenkins v. Briant, 6 Sim. 603 | 69 |
| — v. Jones, 9 Q. B. D. 128; 51 L. J. Q. B. 438; 46 L. T. 795; 30 W. R. 668 | 239 |
| Jennings' Case, 2 Lew. C. C. 130 | 467 |
| Jennings v. Hammond, 9 Q. B. D. 225; 51 L. J. Q. B. 493; 31 W. R. 40 | 556 |
| Jesson v. Wright, 2 Bligh 55 | 287 |
| Jestons v. Brooke, Cowp. 793 | 159 |
| Jesus College Case, Duke on Charit. Uses, p. 78 | 118 |
| Jewel v. Stead, 6 E. & B. 350; 25 L. J. Q. B. 70; 1 Jur. N. S. 1136 | 491 |
| Jewison v. Dyson, 9 M. & W. 556 | 424 |
| Johannes, The, Lush. 112 | 205, 208 |
| Johannisberg Co., <i>Re</i> , [1892] 1 Ch. 583; 61 L. J. Ch. 284; 66 L. T. 605; 40 W. R. 456 | 344 |
| Johnson, <i>Ex parte</i> , 3 B. & S. 947; 9 Jur. N. S. 1128; 32 L. J. M. C. 193; 11 W. R. 620; 8 L. T. N. S. 275 | 9 |
| —, 7 Dowl. 702 | 470 |
| — v. Crédit Lyonnais, 3 C. P. D. 32; 47 L. J. C. P. 241; 37 L. T. 657; 26 W. R. 195 | 123 |
| — v. Colam, L. R. 10 Q. B. 544; 44 L. J. M. C. 185; 32 L. T. 725; 23 W. R. 697 | 185 |
| — v. Croydon, Mayor of, 16 Q. B. D. 708; 55 L. J. M. C. 117; 54 L. T. 295; 50 J. P. 487 | 417 |
| — v. Harris, 15 C. B. 357; 24 L. J. C. P. 40 | 80 |
| — v. Hogg, 10 Q. B. D. 432; 52 L. J. Q. B. 343; 48 L. T. 435; 31 W. R. 768; 5 Asp. M. C. 51 | 464 |
| — v. Hudson, 11 East 180; 10 R. R. 465 | 563 |
| — v. Upham, 2 E. & E. 250 | 58, 356 |
| Jolly v. Hancock, 7 Ex. 820; 22 L. J. Ex. 38; 16 Jur. 550 | 519 |
| Jones, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 10 Ch. 663; 44 L. J. Bkcy. 124; 33 L. T. 116; 23 W. R. 886 | 400 |
| —, 12 Ch. D. 484; 48 L. J. Bkcy. 109; 40 L. T. 790 | 498 |
| —, 18 Ch. D. 109; 50 L. J. Ch. 673; 44 L. T. 587; 29 W. R. 747 | 78 |
| —, <i>Re</i> , 7 Ex. 586; 16 Jur. 801; 21 L. J. M. C. 116 | 461 |
| —, [1891] 2 Q. B. 231; 60 L. J. Q. B. 751; 64 L. T. 804; 40 W. R. 95; 8 M. B. R. 210 | 465 |
| Jones Lloyd & Co., <i>Re</i> , 41 Ch. D. 159; 58 L. J. Ch. 582; 61 L. T. 219; 37 W. R. 615; 1 M. B. R. 161 | 99 |
| — v. Bird, 5 B. & Ald. 837; 1 D. & R. 497 | 504 |
| — v. Carmarthen, 8 M. & W. 605 | 497 |
| — v. Conway Water Supply, [1893] 2 Ch. 603; 62 L. J. Ch. 767; 69 L. T. 265; 41 W. R. 616; 57 J. P. 501 | 283 |

e

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Jones v. Festiniog Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 733 ; 37 L. J. Q. B. 214 ; 18 L. T. 902 ; 17 W. R. 28 ; 9 B. & S. 835 | 506 |
| — <i>v. Harrison</i> , 6 Ex. 328 | 337, 346 |
| — <i>v. Johnson</i> , 7 Ex. 452 ; 21 L. J. M. C. 102 ; 16 Jur. 840 | 284 |
| — <i>v. Mersey Docks Co.</i> , 11 H. L. 443 ; 35 L. J. M. C. 1 | 174, 433 |
| — <i>v. Ogle</i> , L. R. 8 Ch. 192 ; 42 L. J. Ch. 332 ; 28 L. T. 245 ; 21 W. R. 239 | 300 |
| — <i>v. Smart</i> , 1 T. R. 44 | 15 |
| — <i>v. Taylor</i> , 1 E. & E. 20 | 148 |
| — <i>v. Thompson</i> , E. B. & E. 63 ; 27 L. J. Q. B. 234 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 338 | 78 |
| — <i>v. Victoria Graving Dock Co.</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 314 ; 46 L. J. Q. B. 219 ; 36 L. T. 144, 347 ; 25 W. R. 348, 501 | 208, 408, 411 |
| <i>Jortin v. S. E. R. Co.</i> , 6 De G. M. & G. 270 ; 24 L. J. Ch. 343 ; 1 Jur. N. S. 433 | 565 |
| <i>Jory v. Orchard</i> , 2 B. & P. 39 ; 5 R. R. 537. | 102 |
| <i>Joyce v. Booth</i> , 1 B. & P. 97 | 551 |
| <i>Jubb v. Hull Dock Co.</i> , 9 Q. B. 443 ; 3 Rly. Cas. 795 ; 15 L. J. Q. B. 403 ; 11 Jur. 15 | 319 |
| <i>Julius v. Oxford, Bp. of</i> , 5 App. Cas. 214 ; 49 L. J. Q. B. 577 ; 42 L. T. 546 ; 28 W. R. 726 ; 44 J. P. 600 | 340, 346 |

K.

| | |
|--|----------|
| <i>Kay v. Goodwin</i> , 6 Bing. 576 | 586 |
| <i>Kearney v. Whitehaven Colliery Co.</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 700 ; 62 L. J. M. C. 129 ; 68 L. T. 690 ; 41 W. R. 594 ; 57 J. P. 645 | 567 |
| <i>Kearns v. Cordwainers' Co.</i> , 6 C. B. N. S. 388 ; 5 Jur. N. S. 1216 ; 28 L. J. C. P. 285 | 71, 464 |
| <i>Keep v. St. Mary's Newington</i> , [1894] 2 Q. B. 524 ; 63 L. J. Q. B. 369 ; 70 L. T. 509 ; 58 J. P. 748 | 261 |
| <i>Keighley's Case</i> , 10 Rep. 140 a | 172 |
| <i>Keilly v. Carson</i> , 4 Moo. P. C. C. 63 ; 7 Jur. 137 | 506 |
| <i>Kennedy v. Cowie</i> , [1891] 1 Q. B. 771 ; 60 L. J. M. C. 170 ; 64 L. T. 598 ; 39 W. R. 686 ; 55 J. P. 680 ; 17 Cox C. C. 320 | 128 |
| — <i>v. Gibson</i> , 8 Wallace 498 | 352, 458 |
| <i>Kenrick v. Lawrence</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 104 ; 38 W. R. 779. | 58 |
| <i>Kent C. C., Ex parte</i> , [1891] 1 Q. B. 725 ; 60 L. J. Q. B. 435 ; 65 L. T. 213 ; 39 W. R. 465 ; 55 J. P. 647 | 433 |
| <i>Kenworthy v. Schofield</i> , 2 B. & C. 945 ; 4 D. & R. 556 | 408 |
| <i>Kenyon v. Eastwood</i> , 57 L. J. Q. B. 455 | 10 |
| — <i>v. Hart</i> , 6 B. & S. 249 ; 34 L. J. M. C. 87 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 602 ; 11 L. T. 733 ; 13 W. R. 406 | 127 |

| | PAGE |
|---|-----------------------|
| Kerrison <i>v.</i> Cole, 8 East 231 | 566 |
| Keynsham <i>v.</i> Baker, 2 H. & C. 729; 33 L. J. Ex. 41; 9 Jur. N. S. 1346; 12 W. R. 156; 9 L. T. N. S. 418 | 92 |
| Kibble, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 10 Ch. 373; 44 L. J. Bkcy. 63; 32 L. T. 138; 23 W. R. 433 | 308 |
| Kimbray <i>v.</i> Draper, L. R. 3 Q. B. 160; 37 L. J. Q. B. 80; 18 L. T. 540; 16 W. R. 539; 9 B. & S. 80 | 314, 317 |
| Kine <i>v.</i> Evershed, 10 Q. B. 148; 16 L. J. Q. B. 271; 11 Jur. 673 | 325 |
| King, The, <i>v.</i> Cook, 3 T. R. 519 | 189 |
| — <i>v.</i> George, 5 Ch. D. 627; 46 L. J. Ch. 670; 36 L. T. 759; 25 W. R. 638 | 468 |
| — <i>v.</i> Low, 3 C. & P. 620 | 166 |
| Kingsford <i>v.</i> G. W. Ry. Co., 33 L. J. C. P. 307; 16 C. B. N. S. 761; 10 Jur. N. S. 804; 10 L. T. 722; 12 W. R. 1059 | 17, 107 |
| Kinning <i>v.</i> Buchanan, 8 C. B. 271; 18 L. J. C. P. 332 | 515 |
| Kinning's Case, 10 Q. B. 730 | 515 |
| Kirk <i>v.</i> Todd, 21 Ch. D. 484; 52 L. J. Ch. 224; 47 L. T. 676; 31 W. R. 69 | 8, 287 |
| Kirkleatham Local Bd., <i>Re</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 375; 62 L. J. Q. B. 180; 67 L. T. 811; 57 J. P. 229 | 225 |
| Kirkpatrick <i>v.</i> Tattersall, 13 M. & W. 766; 1 C. & K. 577; 14 L. J. Ex. 209; 9 Jur. 214 | 53 |
| Kirkstall Brewery, <i>Re</i> , 5 Ch. D. 535; 46 L. J. Ch. 424; 37 L. T. 312 | 445 |
| Kitchen <i>v.</i> Bartsch, 7 East 53; 3 Smith 58. | 424 |
| — <i>v.</i> Shaw, 6 A. & E. 729; 1 N. & P. 791; W. W. & D. 278 | 469 |
| Kite and Lane's Case, 1 B. & C. 107; 2 D. & R. 212 | 184 |
| Kittow <i>v.</i> Liskeard, L. R. 10 Q. B. 7; 44 L. J. M. C. 23; 31 L. T. 601; 23 W. R. 72 | 98 |
| Knight, <i>Re</i> , 1 Ex. 802; 17 L. J. Ex. 168; 12 Jur. 101 | 229 |
| — <i>v.</i> Crockford, 1 Esp. 190; 5 R. R. 729 | 53 |
| — <i>v.</i> Farnaby, 2 Salk. 670 | 364 |
| — <i>v.</i> Lee, [1893] 1 Q. B. 41; 62 L. J. Q. B. 28; 67 L. T. 688; 41 W. R. 125; 57 J. P. 117 | 301 |
| Knill <i>v.</i> Towse, 24 Q. B. D. 186, 697; 59 L. J. Q. B. 136, 455; 63 L. T. 47; 38 W. R. 521; 54 J. P. 789 | 46 |
| Kronheim <i>v.</i> Johnson, 7 Ch. D. 60; 47 L. J. Ch. 132; 37 L. T. 751; 26 W. R. 142. | 408 |
| Kutner <i>v.</i> Phillips, [1891] 2 Q. B. 267; 60 L. J. Q. B. 505; 64 L. T. 628; 39 W. R. 526 | 214, 243 |
| Kwok Ah Sing <i>v.</i> Atty.-Genl., L. R. 5 P. C. 179; 42 L. J. P. C. 64; 29 L. T. 114; 12 Cox C. C. 565 | 34, 95, 121, 194, 320 |
| Kyle <i>v.</i> Jeffreys, 3 Macq. H. L. Cas. 611 | 223 |
| Kynaston <i>v.</i> Mackinder, 47 L. J. Q. B. 76; 37 L. T. 390 | 488 |

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| L. | |
| <i>Lade v. Trill</i> , 6 Jur. 272 | 545 |
| <i>Lafone v. Smith</i> , 3 H. & N. 735 ; 28 L. J. Ex. 33 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 1064 | 160 |
| <i>Lake v. Butler</i> , 5 E. & B. 92 ; 3 C. L. R. 1124 ; 24 L. J. Q. B. 273 ; 1 Jur. N. S. 499 | 491 |
| <i>Lakeman v. Stephenson</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 192 ; 37 L. J. M. C. 57 ; 18 L. T. 539 ; 16 W. R. 509 ; 9 B. & S. 54 | 393 |
| <i>Laker v. Hordern</i> , 1 Ch. D. 644 ; 45 L. J. Ch. 315 ; 34 L. T. 88 ; 24 W. R. 543 | 32 |
| <i>Lamb v. N. London Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 4 Ch. 522 ; 21 L. T. 98 ; 17 W. R. 746 | 420 |
| <i>Lambert v. Hutchinson</i> , 2 M. & Gr. 858 ; 3 Scott N. R. 221 | 107 |
| — <i>v. Taylor</i> , 4 B. & C. 138 ; 6 D. & R. 188 | 190 |
| <i>Lamplough v. Norton</i> , 22 Q. B. D. 452 ; 53 J. P. 389 ; 58 L. J. Q. B. 279 ; 37 W. R. 422 | 30, 570 |
| <i>Lancashire v. Shelford</i> , E. B. & E. 230 ; 27 L. J. M. C. 209 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 1274 | 188 |
| <i>Lancashire and Yorks. Ry. Co. v. Bury</i> , 14 App. Cas. 417 ; 61 L. T. 417 ; 57 L. J. Q. B. 280 ; 36 W. R. 491 ; 52 J. P. 341 | 508 |
| — <i>v. Knowles</i> , 20 Q. B. D. 391 ; 14 App. Cas. 248 ; 57 L. J. Q. B. 150 ; 52 J. P. 340 | 40 |
| <i>Lancaster, Re</i> , 3 Ch. D. 498 ; 35 L. T. 649 ; 24 W. R. 1010 | 102 |
| — <i>v. Greaves</i> , 9 B. & C. 628 | 470 |
| <i>Lane v. Bennett</i> , 1 M. & W. 70 ; 1 Gale 368 | 21 |
| — <i>v. Cotton</i> , 12 Mod. 485 | 109 |
| — <i>v. Tyler</i> , 56 L. J. Q. B. 461 | 150 |
| <i>Lang v. Kerr</i> , 3 App. Cas. 536 | 71 |
| <i>Langham Rink Co., Re</i> , 5 Ch. D. 669 ; 46 L. J. Ch. 345 ; 36 L. T. 605 | 475 |
| <i>Langrish v. Archer</i> , 10 Q. B. D. 44 ; 52 L. J. M. C. 47 ; 47 L. T. 548 ; 31 W. R. 183 ; 47 J. P. 295 ; 15 Cox C. C. 194 | 391, 481 |
| <i>Langton v. Hughes</i> , 1 M. & S. 593 ; 14 R. R. 531 | 554, 559 |
| <i>Lanman v. Audley</i> , 2 M. & W. 535 | 413 |
| <i>Larchin v. N. W. Bank</i> , L. R. 10 Ex. 64 ; 44 L. J. Ex. 71 ; 33 L. T. 124 ; 23 W. R. 325 | 91 |
| <i>Larker v. Hordern</i> , 1 Ch. D. 644 ; 45 L. J. Ch. 315 ; 34 L. T. 88 ; 24 W. R. 543 | 32 |
| <i>Larpent v. Bibby</i> , 5 H. L. 481 ; 24 L. J. Q. B. 301 | 303 |
| <i>Latham v. Hide</i> , 1 C. & M. 128 ; 1 D. P. C. 594 ; 3 Tyr. 143 | 562 |
| — <i>v. Lafone</i> , L. R. 2 Ex. 115 ; 36 L. J. Ex. 115 ; 15 W. R. 453 ; 15 L. T. N. S. 627 | 71 |
| <i>Latless v. Holmes</i> , 4 T. R. 660 | 595 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxix

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------------------|
| <i>Lauri v. Renard</i> , [1892] 3 Ch. 402; 61 L. J. Ch. 580; 67 L. T. 275; 40 W. R. 679 | 298, 302 |
| <i>Law v. Hodson</i> , 11 East 300; 2 Camp. 147; 10 R. R. 513 | 560 |
| <i>Law Society v. Shaw</i> , 9 Q. B. D. 1; 51 L. J. Q. B. 249; 46 L. T. 187; 30 W. R. 820; 46 J. P. 308 and 8 App. Cas. 407; 52 L. J. Q. B. 674; 49 L. T. 141; 31 W. R. 754 | 375 |
| <i>Lawrence v. G. N. Ry. Co.</i> , 16 Q. B. 643; 20 L. J. Q. B. 293; 15 Jur. 652; 6 Rly. Cas. 656 | 505 |
| — <i>v. King</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 345; 18 L. T. N. S. 356; 16 W. R. 966; 37 L. J. M. C. 8; 9 B. & S. 325 | 51, 452 |
| — <i>v. Wilcock</i> , 11 A. & E. 941; 3 P. & D. 536; 8 D. P. C. 681 | 549 |
| <i>Lawson v. Vacuum Brake Co.</i> , 27 Ch. D. 137; 54 L. J. Ch. 16; 51 L. T. 275; 33 W. R. 186 | 339 |
| <i>Leach v. Jay</i> , 9 Ch. D. 42; 47 L. J. Ch. 876; 27 W. R. 99; 39 L. T. 242 | 82 |
| <i>Lead Smelting Co. v. Richardson</i> , 3 Burr. 1341 | 460 |
| <i>Leader v. Yell</i> , 16 C. B. N. S. 584; 10 L. T. 532; 10 Jur. N. S. 731; 12 W. R. 915 | 378 |
| <i>Learoyd, Ex parte</i> , 13 Ch. D. 321 | 268 |
| — <i>v. Bracken</i> , [1894] 1 Q. B. 114; 63 L. J. Q. B. 96; 69 L. T. 668; 42 W. R. 196 | 564 |
| <i>Leath v. Vine</i> , 30 L. J. M. C. 217; 8 L. T. 581 | 147 |
| <i>Lee v. Bude Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 6 C. P. 576; 40 L. J. C. P. 285; 24 L. T. 827; 19 W. R. 954 | 172, 364 |
| — <i>v. Dangar</i> , [1892] 2 Q. B. 337; 61 L. J. Q. B. 780; 66 L. T. 548; 40 W. R. 469; 56 J. P. 678 | 127, 258, 376 |
| — <i>v. Simpson</i> , 3 C. B. 871; 4 D. & L. 666; 16 L. J. C. P. 105; 11 Jur. 127 | 136 |
| <i>Leech v. N. Staffordshire Ry. Co.</i> , 29 L. J. M. C. 150; 8 W. R. 216; 5 H. & N. 160 | 508 |
| <i>Lees v. Newton</i> , L. R. 1 C. P. 658; 35 L. J. C. P. 285; 14 W. R. 938 | 78 |
| — <i>v. Summersgill</i> , 17 Ves. 508 | 63 |
| <i>Leete v. Hart</i> , L. R. 3 C. P. 322; 37 L. J. C. P. 157; 18 L. T. 292; 16 W. R. 676 | 325 |
| <i>Le Feuvre v. Miller</i> , 8 E. & B. 321; 26 L. J. M. C. 175; 3 Jur. N. S. 1255 | 524, 535 |
| <i>Leggatt v. G. N. Ry. Co.</i> , 1 Q. B. D. 599; 45 L. J. Q. B. 557; 35 L. T. 334; 24 W. R. 784 | 356 |
| <i>Leicester v. Burgess</i> , 5 B. & A. 246; 2 N. & M. 131 | 249 |
| <i>Leigh v. Kent</i> , 3 T. R. 362 | 183, 424, 426, 592, 593 |
| <i>Leith Harbour Comm. v. Poor Inspector</i> , L. R. 1 Sc. App. 17 | 189 |
| <i>Le Louis</i> , 2 Dods. 229 | 200, 203, 208 |

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Leman v. Housley, L. R. 10 Q. B. 66; 44 L. J. Q. B. 22; 31 L. T. 833; 23 W. R. 235 | 309 |
| Lemayne v. Stanley, 3 Lev. 1 | 53, 410 |
| Le Neve v. Le Neve, Amb. 436 | 361 |
| Leominster Canal Co. v. Shrewsbury, &c., Ry. Co., 3 K. & J. 654; 26 L. J. Ch. 764; 3 Jur. N. S. 930 | 524 |
| Leon, The, 6 P. D. 148; 50 L. J. P. 59; 44 L. T. 613; 29 W. R. 916; 4 Asp. M. C. 404 | 213 |
| Leroux v. Brown, 12 C. B. 801; 22 L. J. C. P. 3; 16 Jur. 1021 | 200, 208 |
| Leslie v. Richardson, 6 C. B. 378; 6 D. & L. 91; 17 L. J. C. P. 324; 12 Jur. 730 | 107 |
| Lester v. Foxcroft, Colles 108; 1 Wh. & T. L. Cas. 881 | 361 |
| — v. Garland, 15 Ves. 248; 10 R. R. 68 | 486 |
| — v. Torrens, 2 Q. B. D. 403; 46 L. J. M. C. 280; 25 W. R. 691 | 272, 281 |
| Lester's Case, 16 East 374; 14 R. R. 364 | 242 |
| Le Sueur v. Le Sueur, 1 P. D. 139; 45 L. J. P. 73; 34 L. T. 511; 24 W. R. 616 | 195 |
| Levi v. Sanderson, L. R. 4 Q. B. 330; 38 L. J. Q. B. 135; 17 W. R. 443; 9 B. & S. 410 | 585 |
| Levy v. Yates, 8 A. & E. 129; 3 N. & P. 249; 1 W. W. & H. 219 | 557 |
| Lewes v. Barnett, 6 Ch. D. 252; 47 L. J. Ch. 144; 26 W. R. 101 | 284, 289 |
| Lewis, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 6 Ch. 626; 24 L. T. 785; 19 W. R. 835 | 161 |
| —, 21 Q. B. D. 192; 57 L. J. M. C. 108; 59 L. T. 338; 37 W. R. 13; 52 J. P. 773 | 335 |
| — <i>Re</i> , 1 Q. B. D. 724; 45 L. J. Q. B. 816; 35 L. T. 859; 24 W. R. 1017 | 270 |
| — v. Carr, 1 Ex. D. 484; 46 L. J. Ex. 314; 36 L. T. 44; 24 W. R. 940 | 399 |
| — v. Davis, L. R. 10 Ex. 86; 44 L. J. Ex. 86; 23 W. R. 635 | 533 |
| — v. Fermor, 18 Q. B. D. 532; 56 L. J. M. C. 45; 56 L. T. 236; 35 W. R. 378; 51 J. P. 371; 16 Cox C. C. 176 | 149 |
| — v. G. W. Ry. Co., 3 Q. B. D. 195; 47 L. J. Q. B. 131; 37 L. T. 774; 26 W. R. 255 | 31 |
| — v. Weston Local Bd., 40 Ch. D. 55; 58 L. J. Ch. 39; 59 L. T. 769; 37 W. R. 121 | 106, 175 |
| Lichfield v. Simpson, 8 Q. B. 65; 15 L. J. Q. B. 78 | 575 |
| Liffen v. Pitcher, 6 Jur. 537; 1 D. N. S. 767 | 487 |
| Lightfoot v. Tenant, 1 Bos. & P. 551; 4 R. R. 735 | 559 |
| Lilley v. Rankin, 56 L. J. Q. B. 248; 55 L. T. 814 | 558 |
| Lincoln College Case, 3 Rep. 59 b | 40, 292 |
| — v. Wright, 4 De G. & J. 16 | 360 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxxi

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| <i>Lindsey v. Barron</i> , 6 C. B. 291 | 207 |
| — <i>v. Leigh</i> , 11 Q. B. 455; 3 New Sess. Cas. 99; 19 L. J. M. C. 50; 12 Jur. 286 | 368 |
| <i>Linton v. Blakeney Co-op. Soc.</i> , 3 H. & C. 853; 34 L. J. Ex. 211; 13 L. T. 39; 13 W. R. 843 | 588 |
| <i>Lion Insurance Co. v. Tucker</i> , 12 Q. B. D. 176; 53 L. J. Q. B. 189; 49 L. T. 764; 32 W. R. 546 | 75 |
| <i>Lismore v. Beadle</i> , 1 Dowl. N. S. 566 | 549 |
| <i>Little v. Poole</i> , 9 B. & C. 192 | 560 |
| <i>Littledale, Ex parte</i> , L. R. 9 Ch. 257; 43 L. J. Ch. 529; 30 L. T. 213; 22 W. R. 443 | 153 |
| <i>Liverpool Borough Bank v. Turner</i> , 2 De G. F. & J. 502; 30 L. J. Ch. 379 457, 520, 524, 535 | |
| <i>Llandaff Market Co. v. Lyndon</i> , 8 C. B. N. S. 515; 30 L. J. M. C. 105; 6 Jur. N. S. 1344; 8 W. R. 693 | 249 |
| <i>Lloyd, Ex parte</i> , 1 Sim. N. S. 248 | 434 |
| — —, [1891] 2 Q. B. 231; 60 L. J. Q. B. 751; 64 L. T. 804; 40 W. R. 95; 8 M. B. R. 210 | 463 |
| — <i>v. —</i> , 14 Q. B. D. 725; 53 L. T. 536; 33 W. R. 457; 49 J. P. 630; 15 Cox C. C. 767 | 331 |
| <i>Lloyd Italiano, Re</i> , 29 Ch. D. 219; 54 L. J. Ch. 748; 33 W. R. 728 | 204 |
| <i>Lobb v. Stanley</i> , 5 Q. B. 574; D. & M. 635; 13 L. J. Q. B. 117; 8 Jur. 462 | 53 |
| <i>Lock, Re, Ex parte Poppleton</i> , 63 L. T. 320; 39 W. R. 15; 7 M. B. R. 184 | 20 |
| <i>Lolley's Case</i> , 1 R. & R. 236; 2 C. & F. 567 n. | 195 |
| <i>London and Blackwall Ry. Co. v. Limehouse Board</i> , 3 K. & J. 123; 26 L. J. Ch. 164 | 250 |
| — <i>and Grand Junction Ry. Co. v. Freeman</i> , 2 M. & G. 607; 2 Scott N. R. 705; 2 Rly. Cas. 468 | 536 |
| — <i>and N. W. Ry. v. Evans</i> , [1893] 1 Ch. 1; 62 L. J. Ch. 1; 67 L. T. 630; 41 W. R. 149 | 503 |
| — <i>and S. W. Ry. Co. v. Flower</i> , 1 C. P. D. 77; 45 L. J. C. P. 54; 33 L. T. 687 | 507 |
| — <i>and Yorks. Bank v. Belton</i> , 15 Q. B. D. 457; 54 L. J. Q. B. 568; 34 W. R. 31; 50 J. P. 861 | 99 |
| — <i>Association of Shipowners v. London Docks</i> , [1892] 3 Ch. 242; 62 L. J. Ch. 294; 67 L. T. 238; 7 Asp. M. C. 195 | 440 |
| — <i>Bank of Mexico v. Apthorpe</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 378; 60 L. J. Q. B. 653; 65 L. T. 601; 39 W. R. 564 | 207 |
| — <i>Brighton & S. C. Ry. v. Truman</i> , 11 App. Cas. 45; 55 L. J. Ch. 354; 42 L. T. 250; 34 W. R. 657; 50 J. P. 388 | 505 |
| — — <i>v. Watson</i> , 4 C. P. D. 118; 48 L. J. C. P. 316; 40 L. T. 183 572, 573 | |

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| London C. C. <i>v.</i> Humphreys, [1894] 2 Q. B. 755; 63 L. J. M. C. 215; 58 J. P. 734; 38 Sol. Journ. 632; 71 L. T. 201; 43 W. R. 13 | 87 |
| — C. C. <i>v.</i> London School Board, [1892] 2 Q. B. 606; 40 W. R. 604; 56 J. P. 791 | 219 |
| — Chatham & Dover Ry. <i>v.</i> S. E. Ry., 40 Ch. D. 100; 58 L. J. Ch. 75; 60 L. T. 370; 37 W. R. 65 | 546 |
| — City of, <i>v.</i> Wood, 12 Mod. 688 | 208, 364 |
| — Cotton Co., The, L. R. 2 Eq. 53; 14 L. T. 135; 12 Jur. 313; 35 L. J. Ch. 425; 14 W. R. 575 | 44 |
| — Joint Stock Bank <i>v.</i> Mayor of London, 1 C. P. D. 1; 45 L. J. C. P. 213; 33 L. T. 781 | 439, 461 |
| — School Board <i>v.</i> Wood, 15 Q. B. D. 415; 54 L. J. M. C. 145; 54 L. T. 88; 50 J. P. 54 | 289 |
| — <i>v.</i> Wright, 12 Q. B. D. 578; 53 L. J. Q. B. 266; 50 L. T. 606; 32 W. R. 577; 48 J. P. 484 | 289 |
| — Waterworks Co. <i>v.</i> Bailey, 4 Bing. 283 | 124 |
| Long, <i>Re</i> , 20 Q. B. D. 316; 57 L. J. Q. B. 360; 58 L. T. 664; 36 W. R. 346 | 78 |
| — <i>v.</i> Gray, 1 Moore P. C. C. N. S. 411; 9 Jur. N. S. 805; 8 L. T. 738; 11 W. R. 900 | 444 |
| Longford, The, 14 P. D. 34; 58 L. J. P. & A. 33; 60 L. T. 373; 37 W. R. 372; 6 Asp. M. C. 371 | 84, 280 |
| Longman <i>v.</i> East, 3 C. P. D. 142; 47 L. J. C. P. 211; 38 L. T. 1; 26 W. R. 183 | 414 |
| Looker <i>v.</i> Halcomb, 4 Bing. 188 | 184 |
| Lopez <i>v.</i> Burslem, 4 Moo. P. C. C. 300 | 213 |
| Lord, <i>Re</i> , 1 K. & J. 90; 24 L. J. Ch. 145 | 316 |
| — <i>v.</i> Lee, L. R. 3 Q. B. 404; 9 B. & S. 269; 37 L. J. Q. B. 121; 16 W. R. 856 | 108 |
| Lovering <i>v.</i> Dawson, L. R. 10 C. P. 726; 44 L. J. C. P. 321; 32 L. T. 819 | 515 |
| Low <i>v.</i> Routledge, 33 L. J. Ch. 717; 10 Jur. 922; 10 L. T. 838; 12 W. R. 1069 and L. R. 1 Ch. 42; 35 L. J. Ch. 114; 11 Jur. N. S. 939; 13 L. T. 421; 14 W. R. 90 and L. R. 3 H. L. 100; 37 L. J. Ch. 454; 18 L. T. 874; 16 W. R. 1081 | 85, 522 |
| Lowe, <i>Ex parte</i> , [1891] 1 Ch. 627; 60 L. J. Ch. 292; 64 L. T. 487; 39 W. R. 369; 2 Meg. 418 | 45, 244 |
| — <i>v.</i> Fox, 15 Q. B. D. 667; 54 L. J. Q. B. 561; 53 L. T. 886; 34 W. R. 144; 50 J. P. 244 | 315, 488 |
| Lowther <i>v.</i> Bentinck, L. R. 19 Eq. 166; 31 L. T. 719; 44 L. J. Ch. 197; 32 L. T. 156 | 479 |
| — <i>v.</i> Radnor, 8 East 113 | 470 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxxiii

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Lucas v. Harris</i> , 18 Q. B. D. 127; 56 L. J. Q. B. 15; 55 L. T. 658; 35 W. R. 112; 51 J. P. 261 | 97 |
| <i>Lucey v. Ingram</i> , 6 M. & W. 302 | 496 |
| <i>Lucraft v. Pridham</i> , 6 Ch. D. 205; 47 L. J. Ch. 744; 37 L. T. 208; 26 W. R. 33 | 251 |
| <i>Lumley, Re</i> , [1894] 3 Ch. 135; 63 L. J. Ch. 897; 71 L. T. 7; 42 W. R. 633 | 315 |
| <i>Lundy Co., Re</i> , L. R. 6 Ch. 462; 40 L. J. Ch. 588; 24 L. T. 922; 19 W. R. 609 | 400 |
| <i>Lunt v. London and N. W. Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 1 Q. B. 277; 35 L. J. Q. B. 105; 12 Jur. N. S. 409; 14 L. T. 225; 14 W. R. 497 | 509 |
| <i>Lyde v. Barnard</i> , 1 M. & W. 101; 1 Gale 388 | 329, 353 |
| <i>Lyme Regis v. Henley</i> , 1 Bing. N. C. 222; 5 Bing. 91; 3 B. & A. 77; 3 M. & P. 278 | 582 |
| <i>Lyn v. Wyn, Bridg. Rep. by Bannister</i> , 122 | 214, 243, 246 |
| <i>Lyon v. Fishmongers' Co.</i> , 1 App. Cas. 662; 46 L. J. Ch. 68; 35 L. T. 569; 25 W. R. 165 | 422, 582 |
| <i>Lysaght v. Clark & Co.</i> , [1891] 1 Q. B. 552; 64 L. T. 776 | 204 |

M.

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| <i>Mac, The</i> , 7 P. D. 126; 51 L. J. Adm. 81; 46 L. T. 907 | 100 |
| <i>Macbeth v. Ashley</i> , L. R. 2 Sc. App. 359 | 166, 176 |
| <i>Macclesfield's (Lord) Case</i> , 16 State Trials 1389 | 56 |
| <i>Mace v. Cadell</i> , Cowp. 232 | 66 |
| — <i>v. Philcox</i> , 15 O. B. N. S. 600; 33 L. J. C. P. 124; 10 Jur. N. S. 680; 9 L. T. 766; 12 W. R. 670 | 507 |
| <i>Macfarlane v. Lord Advocate</i> , [1894] App. Cas. 307 | 83 |
| <i>Mackay, Ex parte</i> , L. R. 8 Ch. 643; 42 L. J. Bkcy. 68; 28 L. T. 828; 21 W. R. 664 | 161 |
| <i>Macleod v. Atty.-Gen. for N.S.W.</i> , [1891] A. C. 455; 60 L. J. P. C. 55; 65 L. T. 321 | 196 |
| <i>MacManus v. Cooke</i> , 35 Ch. D. 681; 56 L. J. Ch. 662; 56 L. T. 900; 35 W. R. 754; 51 J. P. 708 | 361 |
| <i>McAlister v. Rochester (Bp.)</i> , 5 C. P. D. 194; 49 L. J. C. P. 443; 42 L. T. 481; 28 W. R. 584 | 545 |
| <i>McCalmont v. Rankin</i> , 2 De G. M. & G. 403; 22 L. J. Ch. 554 | 458 |
| <i>McCarthy v. Metrop. Board</i> , L. R. 7 H. L. 243; 43 L. J. C. P. 385; 31 L. T. 182; 23 W. R. 115; 19 Sol. J. 882 | 131 |
| <i>McDougal v. Paterson</i> , 11 C. B. 755; 2 L. M. & P. 681; 6 Ex. 337 n.; 15 Jur. 1108; 21 L. J. C. P. 27 | 3, 90, 337, 345 |
| <i>McGregor v. Deal, &c. Ry. Co.</i> , 18 Q. B. 618; 7 Rly. Cas. 227; 22 L. J. Q. B. 69; 17 Jur. 21 | 539 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| McIntosh, <i>Re</i> , 61 L. J. Q. B. 164 | 549 |
| McKinnon v. Penson, 9 Ex. 609 ; 23 L. J. M. C. 97 ; 18 Jur. 513 | 583 |
| McLean v. Nicoll, 7 Jur. N. S. 999 ; 4 L. T. 863 ; 9 W. R. 811 | 409 |
| — v. Prichard, 20 Q. B. D. 285 ; 58 L. T. 337 ; 36 W. R. 508 | 93 |
| McMaster v. Lomax, 2 Myl. & K. 32 | 38 |
| McWilliam v. Adams, 1 Macq. H. L. 176 | 46 |
| McWilliams, <i>Ex parte</i> , 1 Sch. & Lef. 169 | 78 |
| Maddison v. Alderson, 8 App. Cas. 473 ; 52 L. J. Q. B. 737 ; 49 L. T. 303 ; 31 W. R. 820 ; 47 J. P. 821 | 360, 361 |
| Madell v. Thomas, [1891] 1 Q. B. 230 ; 60 L. J. Q. B. 227 ; 64 L. T. 9 ; 39 W. R. 280 | 158, 161 |
| Madrazo v. Willes, 3 B. & A. 353 | 203 |
| Magdalen College Case, 11 Rep. 71 b | 157, 187, 192 |
| — Hospital v. Knotts, 4 App. Cas. 324 ; 48 L. J. Ch. 579 ; 40 L. T. 466 ; 27 W. R. 682 | 290, 291 |
| Maggi, <i>Re</i> , 20 Ch. D. 545 ; 51 L. J. Ch. 560 ; 46 L. T. 362 ; 30 W. R. 729 | 132 |
| Magnet, <i>The</i> , L. R. 4 A. & E. 417 | 279 |
| Makin v. Watkinson, L. R. 6 Ex. 25 ; 40 L. J. Ex. 33 ; 23 L. T. 592 ; 19 W. R. 286 | 507 |
| Maleverer v. Redshaw, 1 Mod. 35 | 564 |
| Malins v. Freeman, 4 Bing. N. C. 395 | 290 |
| Mallan v. May, 13 M. & W. 511 ; 14 L. J. Ex. 48 ; 9 Jur. 19 | 3 |
| Manchester (Mayor) v. Lyons, 22 Ch. D. 277 | 227 |
| Manley v. St. Helen's Co., 2 H. & N. 840 ; 27 L. J. Ex. 159 | 508 |
| Manning v. Phelps, 10 Ex. 59 ; 24 L. J. Ex. 62 | 229 |
| Mansell v. R., 8 E. & B. 54 ; Dears. & B. C. C. 375 ; 27 L. J. M. C. 4 | 433 |
| Maple & Co. v. Junior A. & N. Stores, 21 Ch. D. 369 ; 52 L. J. Ch. 67 ; 47 L. T. 589 ; 31 W. R. 70 | 99 |
| March, <i>Re</i> , Mander v. Harris, 27 Ch. D. 166 ; 54 L. J. Ch. 143 ; 51 L. T. 380 ; 32 W. R. 241 | 117, 300 |
| Margate Pier Co. v. Hannam, 3 B. & Ald. 266 | 534 |
| Margetson v. Glyn, [1892] 1 Q. B. 337 ; 61 L. J. Q. B. 186 ; 66 L. T. 142 ; 40 W. R. 264 ; 7 Asp. M. C. 148 | 286 |
| Maria, <i>The</i> , 1 W. Rob. 95 | 496 |
| Marianna Flora, <i>The</i> , 11 Wheat. 40 | 208 |
| Marine Mansions Co., <i>Re</i> , L. R. 4 Eq. 601 ; 37 L. J. Ch. 113 | 537 |
| Market Harborough v. Kettering H. B., L. R. 8 Q. B. 308 ; 42 L. J. M. C. 137 ; 28 L. T. 446 ; 21 W. R. 737 | 70 |
| Markham v. Stanford, 14 C. B. N. S. 376 ; 8 L. T. 277 | 545 |
| Marks v. Benjamin, 5 M. & W. 565 ; 3 Jur. 1194 | 397 |
| Marlborough, <i>Re</i> Duke of, [1894] 2 Ch. 133 ; 63 L. J. Ch. 471 ; 70 L. T. 314 ; 42 W. R. 456 | 360 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxxv

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Marsden, <i>Ex parte</i> , 2 Ch. D. 786; 45 L. J. Bk. 141; 34 L. T. 700; 24 W. R. 714 | 516 |
| — <i>v. Meadows</i> , 7 Q. B. D. 80; 50 L. J. Q. B. 536; 45 L. T. 301; 29 W. R. 816 | 132, 161 |
| Marsden <i>v. Savile Foundry</i> , 3 Ex. D. 203; 26 W. R. 784 | 12 |
| Marsh <i>v. Higgins</i> , 9 C. B. 551; 1 L. M. & P. 253; 13 L. J. C. P. 297 | 303, 311 |
| Marshall <i>v. Berridge</i> , 19 Ch. D. 233; 51 L. J. Ch. 329; 45 L. T. 599; 30 W. R. 93; 46 J. P. 279 | 407 |
| — <i>v. Bp. of Exeter</i> , 13 C. B. N. S. 820 | 424 |
| — <i>v. Bown</i> , 7 M. & Gr. 188; 8 Scott N. R. 899; 1 Lut. Reg. Cas. 278; 14 L. J. C. P. 129; 9 Jur. 164 | 125, 291 |
| — <i>v. Martin</i> , L. R. 5 Q. B. 239; 39 L. J. Q. B. 85; 21 L. T. 788; 18 W. R. 378 | 242 |
| — <i>v. Nicholls</i> , 18 Q. B. 882; 21 L. J. Q. B. 343; 16 Jur. 1155 | 181 |
| — <i>v. Pitman</i> , 9 Bing. 601; 2 M. & Scott 745 | 174 |
| — <i>v. Ulleswater Co.</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 166; 41 L. J. Q. B. 41; 25 L. T. 793; 20 W. R. 144 | 582 |
| Marson <i>v. Lund</i> , 13 Q. B. 664 | 338 |
| Martin, <i>Ex parte</i> , 4 Q. B. D. 212, 491; 48 L. J. Q. B. 667; 28 W. R. 143 | 500 |
| — <i>v. Ford</i> , 5 T. R. 101 | 392 |
| — <i>v. Hemming</i> , 10 Ex. 476; 24 L. J. Ex. 5 | 38 |
| — <i>v. Maconochie</i> , L. R. 2 P. C. 365; 38 L. J. Ex. 1; 19 L. T. 503; 17 W. R. 187 | 519 |
| Mason <i>v. Aird</i> , 51 L. J. Q. B. 244; 30 W. R. 522 | 325 |
| — <i>v. Barker</i> , 1 C. & K. 100 | 538 |
| Massey <i>v. Burton</i> , 2 H. & N. 597; 27 L. J. Ex. 101; 3 Jur. N. S. 1130 | 165 |
| — <i>v. Morriss</i> , [1894] 2 Q. B. 412; 63 L. J. M. C. 185; 70 L. T. 873; 42 W. R. 638; 58 J. P. 673 | 146, 389 |
| — <i>v. Sladen</i> , L. R. 4 Ex. 13; 38 L. J. Ex. 34 | 488 |
| Massy <i>v. Johnson</i> , 12 East 67 | 490 |
| Masters, <i>Re</i> , 33 L. J. Q. B. 146; 9 L. T. N. S. 733 | 63 |
| — <i>v. Child</i> , 3 Salk. 66 | 164 |
| Mather <i>v. Brown</i> , 1 C. P. D. 596; 45 L. J. C. P. 547; 34 L. T. 869; 24 W. R. 736 | 522 |
| — <i>v. Fraser</i> , 2 K. & J. 536; 25 L. J. Ch. 361; 2 Jur. N. S. 900 | 132 |
| — <i>v. Scott</i> , 2 Keen 172 | 164 |
| Mathieson <i>v. Harrod</i> , L. R. 7 Eq. 270; 38 L. J. Ch. 139; 19 L. T. 629; 17 W. R. 99 | 522 |
| Mattison <i>v. Hart</i> , 14 C. B. 385; 2 C. L. R. 314; 23 L. J. C. P. 108; 18 Jur. 380 | 3 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Maurice v. Marsden , 19 L. J. C. P. 152 | 573 |
| May, Ex parte , 2 B. & S. 426; 31 L. J. M. C. 161 | 266 |
| — v. G. W. Ry. Co. , L. R. 7 Q. B. 364; L. R. 8 Q. B. 26; 41 L. J. Q. B. 104; 42 L. J. Q. B. 6; 26 L. T. 17; 27 L. T. 620 | 5, 399 |
| Mayer v. Harding , L. R. 2 Q. B. 410; 16 L. T. 429; 15 W. R. 813; 9 B. & S. 27 n. | 542 |
| Mayhew v. Wardley , 14 C. B. N. S. 550; 8 L. T. 504. | 274, 390, 437 |
| Mayor v. Collins , 24 Q. B. D. 261; 59 L. J. Q. B. 199; 62 L. T. 326; 38 W. R. 349 | 126 |
| Melliss v. Shirley Loc. Bd. , 16 Q. B. D. 446; 55 L. J. Q. B. 143; 53 L. T. 810; 34 W. R. 187; 50 J. P. 214 | 539, 554 |
| Mercers' Co. v. Bowker , 1 Stra. 639 | 364 |
| Merchant Taylors v. Truscott , 11 Ex. 855; 25 L. J. Ex. 173; 2 Jur. N. S. 356 | 251 |
| Meredith v. Holman , 16 M. & W. 798; 16 L. J. Ex. 126 | 373 |
| Mersey Docks v. Cameron , 11 H. L. 443; 35 L. J. M. C. 22; 12 L. T. 643; 13 W. R. 1069; 20 C. B. N. S. 56; 11 Jur. N. S. 746 | 188, 189 |
| — v. Henderson , 13 App. Cas. 595; 58 L. J. Q. B. 152; 59 L. T. 697; 37 W. R. 449. | 333 |
| — v. Lucas , 8 App. Cas. 891; 53 L. J. Q. B. 4; 49 L. T. 781; 32 W. R. 34; 48 J. P. 212 | 188, 221, 251 |
| Metrop. Asylums District v. Hill , 6 App. Cas. 193; 50 L. J. Q. B. 353; 44 L. T. 653; 29 W. R. 617; 45 J. P. 664 | 505 |
| Metrop. Board v. Metrop. Ry. Co. , L. R. 4 C. P. 192; 38 L. J. C. P. 172; 19 L. T. 744; 17 W. R. 416 | 505 |
| — v. Steed , 8 Q. B. D. 447; 51 L. J. M. C. 24; 45 L. T. 612; 30 W. R. 891 | 333 |
| Metrop. Ry. v. Fowler , [1893] A. C. 416; 62 L. J. Q. B. 553; 69 L. T. 390; 42 W. R. 270; 57 J. P. 756 | 474 |
| Mette v. Mette , 1 Sw. & Tr. 416; 28 L. J. P. 117 | 195 |
| Mew, Re , 31 L. J. Bk. 89; 10 W. R. 790 | 37 |
| Michell v. Brown , 1 E. & E. 267; 28 L. J. M. C. 53; 5 Jur. N. S. 707. | 259, 260 |
| Micklethwaite, Re , 11 Ex. 452; 25 L. J. Ex. 19. | 402 |
| Middlesex JJ. v. R. , 9 App. Cas. 757; 53 L. J. Q. B. 509; 51 L. T. 513; 48 J. P. 104; 33 W. R. 49; 15 Cox C. C. 542 | 57 |
| Middleton v. Chichester , L. R. 6 Ch. 152; 40 L. J. Ch. 237; 24 L. T. 173; 19 W. R. 299, 369 | 289 |
| — v. Crofts , 2 Atk. 674 | 259 |
| Midland Ry. Co. v. Pye , 10 C. B. N. S. 179; 30 L. J. C. P. 314; 4 L. T. 510; 9 W. R. 658 | 5, 298, 304 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxxvii

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------------|
| Midland Ry. Co. v. Withington Loc. Bd., 11 Q. B. D. 788; 52 L. J. Q. B. 689; 49 L. T. 489; 47 J. P. 789 | 325 |
| Migneault v. Malo, L. R. 4 P. C. 123; 41 L. J. P. C. 11; 26 L. T. 329; 20 W. R. 527; 8 Moo. P. C. C. N. S. 347 | 430 |
| Migotti v. Colville, 4 C. P. D. 233; 48 L. J. C. P. 695; 40 L. T. 747; 27 W. R. 744; 14 Cox C. C. 305 | 487 |
| Miles v. Bough, 3 Q. B. 845; 3 G. & D. 119; 3 Rly. Cas. 668; 12 L. J. Q. B. 74 | 105 |
| Mill v. Hawker, L. R. 10 Ex. 92; 44 L. J. Ex. 49; 33 L. T. 177; 24 W. R. 348 | 444 |
| Miller's Case, 1 W. Bl. 451 | 586 |
| Miller, Re, [1893] 1 Q. B. 327; 62 L. J. Q. B. 324; 68 L. T. 367; 41 W. R. 243; 57 J. P. 469; 10 M. B. R. 21 | 101 |
| — v. Salomons, 7 Ex. 475; 21 L. J. Ex. 197 | 4, 5, 287, 319, 358 |
| Mills' Estate, Re, 34 Ch. D. 186; 56 L. J. Ch. 118; 55 L. T. 665; 35 W. R. 133 | 116 |
| — v. Scott, L. R. 8 Q. B. 202; 42 L. J. Q. B. 57; 28 L. T. 265; 21 W. R. 438 | 495 |
| — v. Wilkins, 6 Mod. 62 | 57 |
| Milnes v. Huddersfield (Mayor of), 11 App. Cas. 511; 56 L. J. Q. B. 1; 55 L. T. 617; 34 W. R. 761; 50 J. P. 676 | 419 |
| Milton v. Faversham, 10 B. & S. 548 n. | 382 |
| Minehead Loc. Bd. v. Luttrell, [1894] 2 Ch. 178; 63 L. J. Ch. 497; 70 L. T. 446; 42 W. R. 667 | 283 |
| Minet v. Leman, 20 Beav. 278; 24 L. J. Ch. 547; 7 De G. M. & G. 340; 1 Jur. N. S. 410, 692 | 113, 251 |
| Minor v. London & N. W. Ry. Co., 1 C. B. N. S. 325; 26 L. J. C. P. 39; 2 Jur. N. S. 1168; 28 L. T. O. S. 104 | 92, 465 |
| Mirehouse v. Rennell, 1 Cl. & F. 527; 8 Bing. 490; 1 M. & Scott 683; 7 Bligh N. S. 241 | 5 |
| Mirfin v. Attwood, L. R. 4 Q. B. 330; 38 L. J. Q. B. 181; 20 L. T. 778; 17 W. R. 820; 9 B. & S. 414 | 585 |
| Mitchell v. Darley Colliery, 11 App. Cas. 127; 55 L. J. Q. B. 529; 54 L. T. 882; 51 J. P. 148 | 8 |
| — v. Simpson, 25 Q. B. D. 183; 59 L. J. Q. B. 355; 63 L. T. 405; 38 W. R. 565 | 84 |
| Mitford Union v. Wayland Union, 25 Q. B. D. 164; 59 L. J. M. C. 24; 63 L. T. 299; 38 W. R. 632; 54 J. P. 757 | 242 |
| Mobbs v. Vandenbrande, 4 B. & S. 904; 33 L. J. Q. B. 177; 10 Jur. N. S. 745; 9 L. T. 760; 12 W. R. 405 | 406, 407 |
| Moggs v. Hodges, 2 Ves. Sen. 52 | 511 |
| Mohammed v. Barsilly, L. R. 1 Ind. App. 167 | 10 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| Moir v. Williams, [1892] 1 Q. B. 264 ; 61 L. J. M. C. 33 ; 66 L. T. 215 ; 40 W. R. 69 ; 56 J. P. 197 | 447 |
| Mollwo v. Court of Wards, L. R. 4 P. C. 419 | 438 |
| Molton v. Camroux, 4 Ex. 17 ; 18 L. J. Ex. 356 | 551 |
| Monok v. Hilton, 3 Ex. D. 268 ; 46 L. J. M. C. 163 ; 36 L. T. 66 ; 25 W. R. 373 | 75 |
| Monkleigh, <i>Ex parte</i> , 5 D. & L. 404 | 516 |
| Monks v. Jackson, 1 C. P. D. 683 ; 46 L. J. C. P. 162 ; 35 L. T. 95 | 103, 105 |
| Montague v. Smith, 17 Q. B. 688 ; 21 L. J. Q. B. 73 | 454 |
| Montreal (Mayor of) v. Stevens, 3 App. Cas. 605 ; 47 L. J. P. C. 67 | 414 |
| Montrose Peerage, 1 Macq. H. L. 401 | 424 |
| Moore, <i>Ex parte</i> , <i>In re</i> Faithfull, 14 Q. B. D. 627 ; 34 L. J. Q. B. 190 ; 52 L. T. 376 ; 33 W. R. 438 ; 2 M. B. R. 52 | 76 |
| — v. Clench, 1 Ch. D. 447 ; 45 L. J. Ch. 80 ; 34 L. T. 13 ; 24 W. R. 169 | 510 |
| — v. Durden, 2 Ex. 22 ; 12 Jur. 138 | 301 |
| — v. Gamgee, 25 Q. B. D. 244 ; 38 W. R. 669 ; 59 L. J. Q. B. 505 | 547 |
| — v. Lambeth W. Works Co., 17 Q. B. D. 462 ; 55 L. J. Q. B. 304 ; 55 L. T. 309 ; 34 W. R. 559 ; 50 J. P. 756 | 584 |
| — v. Smith, 1 E. & E. 597 ; 28 L. J. M. C. 126 | 192 |
| Morant v. Taylor, 1 Ex. D. 188 ; 45 L. J. M. C. 78 ; 34 L. T. 139 ; 24 W. R. 461 | 57 |
| Morden v. Porter, 7 C. B. N. S. 641 ; 29 L. J. M. C. 213 ; 1 L. T. 403 ; 6 W. R. 262 | 137, 139 |
| Moreton v. Holt, 10 Ex. 707 ; 24 L. J. Ex. 169 ; 1 Jur. N. S. 215 | 181 |
| Morgan v. Bowles, [1894] 1 Q. B. 6 ; 63 L. J. Q. B. 84 ; 42 W. R. 269 | 247 |
| — v. Brown, 4 A. & E. 515 ; 6 N. & M. 57 ; 1 H. & W. 717 | 274 |
| — v. Crawshay, L. R. 5 H. L. 304 ; 40 L. J. M. C. 202 ; 24 L. T. 889 ; 20 W. R. 554 | 427, 460 |
| — v. Davies, 3 C. P. D. 260 ; 39 L. T. 60 ; 26 W. R. 816 | 485 |
| — v. Edwards, 5 H. & N. 415 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 379 ; 29 L. J. M. C. 108 | 526, 542, 550 |
| — v. London Gen. Omnibus Co., 13 Q. B. D. 832 ; 52 L. J. Q. B. 352 ; 51 L. T. 213 ; 32 W. R. 759 ; 48 J. P. 503 | 470 |
| — v. Metrop. Ry. Co., L. R. 4 C. P. 97 ; 38 L. J. C. P. 87 | 420 |
| — v. Palmer, 2 B. & C. 729 ; 4 D. & R. 283 | 326 |
| — v. Parry, 17 C. B. 334 ; 25 L. J. C. P. 141 ; 2 Jur. N. S. 285 | 529 |
| — v. Thorne, 7 M. & W. 400 ; 9 D. P. C. 228 ; 5 Jur. 294 | 586, 587 |
| Morish v. Harris, L. R. 1 C. P. 155 ; 35 L. J. C. P. 101 ; 12 Jur. N. S. 627 ; 14 L. T. 764 ; 14 W. R. 479 ; 1 H. & R. 358 ; 1 H. & P. 305 | 474, 477 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxxix

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Morisse v. Royal Brit. Bk.</i> , 1 C. B. N. S. 67; 26 L. J. C. P. 62; 3 Jur. N. S. 137 | 217, 347 |
| <i>Morrall v. Sutton</i> , 1 Phil. 533; 14 L. J. Ch. 266; 9 Jur. 637 | 77, 215 |
| <i>Morris v. Mellin</i> , 6 B. & C. 446 | 295, 432, 455 |
| — <i>v. Wilson</i> , 5 Jur. N. S. 168 | 408 |
| <i>Morrison v. Gen. Steam. Navig. Co.</i> , 22 L. J. Ex. 233 | 251 |
| — <i>v. Glover</i> , 4 Ex. 430; 19 L. J. Ex. 20 | 124 |
| <i>Morritt v. N. E. Ry. Co.</i> , 1 Q. B. D. 302; 45 L. J. Q. B. 289; 34 L. T. 940; 24 W. R. 386 | 16 |
| <i>Morse v. Tucker</i> , 5 Hare 79 | 69 |
| <i>Morton v. Copeland</i> , 16 C. B. 517; 24 L. J. C. P. 169; 1 Jur. N. S. 979 | 102 |
| — <i>v. Palmer</i> , 51 L. J. Q. B. 7; 45 L. T. 426; 30 W. R. 115 | 93 |
| <i>Mosdel v. Middleton</i> , 1 Vent. 237 | 565 |
| <i>Mostyn v. Fabrigas</i> , Cowp. 161; 1 Sm. L. C. 652 | 209 |
| <i>Motteram v. E. C. Ry. Co.</i> , 7 C. B. N. S. 58; 29 L. J. M. C. 59; 6 Jur. N. S. 583 | 353 |
| <i>Mouffet v. Cole</i> , L. R. 8 Ex. 32; 42 L. J. Ex. 8; 27 L. T. 678; 21 W. R. 175 | 491 |
| <i>Moul v. Groenings</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 443; 60 L. J. Q. B. 715; 65 L. T. 327; 39 W. R. 691 | 445 |
| <i>Mounsey v. Ismay</i> , 34 L. J. Ex. 56; 3 H. & C. 486; 11 Jur. N. S. 141 | 38, 465 |
| <i>Mount v. Taylor</i> , L. R. 3 C. P. 645; 37 L. J. C. P. 325; 18 L. T. 476; 16 W. R. 866 | 585 |
| <i>Mountcashel v. O'Neil</i> , 5 H. L. 937; 2 Jur. N. S. 1030 | 103 |
| <i>Mountjoy v. Wood</i> , 1 H. & N. 58 | 190 |
| <i>Mouys v. Leake</i> , 8 T. R. 411 | 566 |
| <i>Moxon v. Sheppard</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 627; 59 L. J. Q. B. 286; 62 L. T. 726; 38 W. R. 704 | 18 |
| <i>Moyle v. Jenkins</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 116; 51 L. J. Q. B. 112; 30 W. R. 324 | 40 |
| <i>Much Waltham v. Peram</i> , 2 Salk. 474 | 165 |
| <i>Muggridge, Re</i> , Johns. 625; 29 L. J. Ch. 288 | 86 |
| <i>Muir v. Hore</i> , 47 L. J. M. C. 17; 37 L. T. 315 | 234 |
| — <i>v. Keay</i> , L. R. 10 Q. B. 594; 44 L. J. M. C. 143; 23 W. R. 700 | 462 |
| <i>Muirhead, Ex parte</i> , 2 Ch. D. 22; 45 L. J. Bk. 65; 33 L. T. 303; 24 W. R. 351 | 78 |
| <i>Mulkern v. Lord</i> , 4 App. Cas. 182; 48 L. J. Ch. 745; 40 L. T. 594; 27 W. R. 510 | 124, 182 |
| <i>Mulliner v. Midland Ry. Co.</i> , 11 Ch. D. 611; 48 L. J. Ch. 258; 40 L. T. 121; 27 W. R. 330 | 507 |
| <i>Mullins v. Collins</i> , L. R. 9 Q. B. 292; 43 L. J. M. C. 67; 29 L. T. 838; 22 W. R. 297 | 145 |

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Mumford v. Collier, 25 Q. B. D. 279; 59 L. J. Q. B. 552; 38 W. R. 716 | 566 |
| Munday v. Asprey, 13 Ch. D. 855; 49 L. J. Ch. 216; 28 W. R. 347 | 408 |
| Mundy v. Rutland, 23 Ch. D. 81; 31 W. R. 510; 46 L. T. 477 | 26 |
| Municipal Bldg. Soc. v. Kent, 9 App. Cas. 260; 53 L. J. Q. B. 290; 51 L. T. 6; 32 W. R. 681; 48 J. P. 352 | 124, 181 |
| Munro v. Butt, 8 E. & B. 738; 4 Jur. N. S. 1231 | 286 |
| Murphy, <i>Re</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 397; 46 L. J. M. C. 193; 36 L. T. 698; 25 W. R. 536 | 229 |
| Murray v. Charming Betsy, 2 Cranch 118 | 200 |
| — v. E. I. Co., 5 B. & A. 204 | 458 |
| — v. Thornley, 2 C. B. 217; 1 Lut. Reg. Cas. 496; 1 Bar. & Arn. 742; 15 L. J. C. P. 155; 10 Jur. 270 | 47 |
| Murtagh v. Barry, 24 Q. B. D. 632; 59 L. J. Q. B. 388; 38 W. R. 526 | 413 |
| Musgrave, <i>Ex parte</i> , 3 M. D. & D. 380 | 551 |
| Musurus Bey v. Gadban, [1894] 2 Q. B. 352; 63 L. J. Q. B. 621; 71 L. T. 51; 42 W. R. 545 | 201 |
| Mutter v. Eastern and Midlands Ry., 38 Ch. D. 92; 57 L. J. Ch. 315; 59 L. T. 117; 36 W. R. 401 | 495 |
| Myers v. Veitch, L. R. 4 Q. B. 649; 38 L. J. Q. B. 316; 20 L. T. 847; 17 W. R. 918 | 48, 455 |

N.

| | |
|--|----------|
| Nance, <i>Re</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 590; 62 L. J. Q. B. 500; 68 L. T. 733; 41 W. R. 370 | 499 |
| National Merc. Bank, <i>Ex parte</i> , <i>in re</i> Haynes, 15 Ch. D. 42; 49 L. J. Bkcy. 62; 43 L. T. 36; 28 W. R. 848; 44 J. P. 780 | 23, 384 |
| National Telephone Co. v. Baker, [1893] 2 Ch. 186; 62 L. J. Ch. 699; 68 L. T. 283; 57 J. P. 373 | 503 |
| Nazer v. Wade, 1 B. & S. 728; 31 L. J. Q. B. 5; 8 Jur. N. S. 134; 5 L. T. 604 | 19 |
| Nesbitt v. Lushington, 4 T. R. 783; 2 R. R. 519 | 463 |
| Nethersoll v. Indig. Blind, L. R. 11 Eq. 1; 40 L. J. Ch. 26; 23 L. T. 723; 19 W. R. 174 | 511 |
| Nettleton v. Burrell, 8 Scott N. R. 738; 7 M. & Gr. 35; 8 Jur. 1033; 2 D. & L. 598; 1 Lut. Reg. Cas. 157; 14 L. J. C. P. 37 | 19 |
| New Eberhardt Co., <i>Re</i> , 43 Ch. D. 118; 59 L. J. Ch. 73; 62 L. T. 301; 38 W. R. 97; 1 Meg. 441 | 11 |
| Newby v. Colt's Arms Co., L. R. 7 Q. B. 293; 41 L. J. Q. B. 148; 26 L. T. 164; 20 W. R. 383 | 92 |
| Newcastle v. A.-G., 12 Cl. & F. 402 | 118, 424 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxxxi

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------------------|
| Newcastle v. Morris, L. R. 4 H. L. 661; 40 L. J. Bk. 4; 23 L. T. 569; 19 W. R. 26 | 248, 436 |
| Newington v. Cottingham, 12 Ch. D. 725; 48 L. J. Ch. 226; 40 L. T. 58 | 553 |
| Newman v. Hardwicke, 3 N. & P. 368; 8 A. & E. 124; 1 W. W. & H. 284 | 486 |
| — v. Jones, 17 Q. B. D. 137; 55 L. J. M. C. 113; 55 L. T. 327; 50 J. P. 373 | 145, 146 |
| Newport Bridge, Re, 2 E. & E. 377; 29 L. J. M. C. 52; 6 Jur. N. S. 97; 1 L. T. 131 | 339 |
| — Trustees, Ex parte, 16 Sim. 346; 18 L. J. Ch. 49; 12 Jur. 932 | 494 |
| New River Co. v. Johnson, 2 El. & El. 435; 29 L. J. M. C. 93; 6 Jur. N. S. 374; 8 W. R. 179 | 130 |
| Newton v. Boodle, 3 C. B. 795; 4 D. & L. 664; 16 L. J. C. P. 135; 11 Jur. 148 | 19 |
| — v. Cowie, 4 Bing. 234; 12 Moore 457 | 522 |
| — v. Ellis, 5 E. & B. 115; 24 L. J. Q. B. 337; 1 Jur. N. S. 850 | 101, 325, 470 |
| — v. Young, 1 B. & P. N. R. 187 | 284 |
| Nga Hoong v. R., 7 Cox 489; 7 Moo. Ind. App. 72 | 85, 202 |
| Niboyet v. Niboyet, 4 P. D. 1; 48 L. J. P. 1; 39 L. T. 486; 27 W. R. 203 | 195 |
| Nicholl v. Allen, 1 B. & S. 934; 31 L. J. Q. B. 283; 6 L. T. 699; 10 W. R. 741 | 344, 508 |
| Nichols v. Marsland, 2 Ex. D. 1; 46 L. J. Ex. 174; 35 L. T. 725; 25 W. R. 173 | 541 |
| Nicholson v. Ellis, E. B. & E. 267; 28 L. J. M. C. 238; 5 Jur. N. S. 385 | 270 |
| — v. Fields, 31 L. J. Ex. 236; 7 H. & N. 810; 10 W. R. 304 | 369, 370, 398, 399, 402 |
| — v. Holborn Assessment Committee, 18 Q. B. D. 161; 56 L. J. M. C. 54; 55 L. T. 775; 35 W. R. 230; 51 J. P. 341 | 189 |
| — v. Hood, 9 M. & W. 365; 12 L. J. Ex. 114; 6 Jur. 64 | 102 |
| Nicolls v. Hall, L. R. 8 C. P. 322; 42 L. J. M. C. 105; 21 W. R. 579; 28 L. T. 473 | 140 |
| Nina, The, L. R. 2 P. C. 38; 37 L. J. Ad. 17; 17 L. T. 585; 5 Moo. P. C. C. N. S. 60 | 213 |
| Nitro-phosphate Co. v. St. Katherine Dock Co., 9 Ch. D. 503; 39 L. T. 433; 27 W. R. 267 | 582 |
| Nixon v. Phillips, 7 Ex. 192; 21 L. J. Ex. 80 | 6, 234 |
| Noble v. Durell, 3 T. R. 271 | 431 |
| — v. Gadban, 5 H. L. 504 | 303 |

f

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Norcutt <i>v.</i> Dodd, Cr. & Ph. 100 | 86, 110 |
| Norden <i>v.</i> James, 2 Dick. 533 | 196 |
| Nordenfelt, <i>Re</i> , [1895] 1 Q. B. 151; 64 L. J. Q. B. 182; 71 L. T. 565 | 54 |
| Norman, <i>Re</i> , [1893] 2 Q. B. 369; 63 L. J. Q. B. 34; 69 L. T. 674 | 318 |
| Norris, <i>Re</i> , 5 M. B. R. 11 | 203, 465 |
| — <i>v.</i> Carrington, 16 C. B. N. S. 10 | 542 |
| — <i>v.</i> Crocker, 13 Howard 429 | 259 |
| N. London Ry. Co. <i>v.</i> Metrop. B. of Works, Johns. 405; 28 L. J. Ch. 909; 5 Jur. N. S. 1121 | 422 |
| N. Staffordshire Ry. Co. <i>v.</i> Dale, 8 E. & B. 836; 27 L. J. M. C. 147; 4 Jur. N. S. 631 | 508 |
| N. Wales Gunpowder Co., <i>Re</i> , [1892] 2 Q. B. 220; 61 L. J. Q. B. 625; 67 L. T. 178; 40 W. R. 561 | 222 |
| Northwich <i>v.</i> St. Pancras, 22 Q. B. D. 164; 58 L. J. M. C. 73; 60 L. T. 444; 37 W. R. 206; 53 J. P. 196 | 242 |
| Norton <i>v.</i> Lond. & N. W. Ry. Co., 11 Ch. D. 118; 40 L. T. 597; 27 W. R. 773 | 418 |
| — <i>v.</i> Simmes, Hob. 12 | 564 |
| Noseworthy <i>v.</i> Buckland, L. R. 9 C. P. 233; 43 L. J. C. P. 27; 29 L. T. 675; 22 W. R. 155; 2 Hop. & C. 127 | 523 |
| Notley <i>v.</i> Buck, 8 B. & C. 164 | 4 |
| Novello <i>v.</i> Sudlow, 12 C. B. 177; 21 L. J. C. P. 169; 16 Jur. 689 | 576 |
| — <i>v.</i> Toogood, 1 B. & C. 554; 2 D. & R. 833 | 156 |
| Nowell <i>v.</i> Mayor, &c., of Worcester, 9 Ex. 457; 2 C. L. R. 981; 23 L. J. Ex. 139; 18 Jur. 64 | 539 |
| Nugent <i>v.</i> Smith, 1 C. P. D. 423; 44 L. J. C. P. 697; 34 L. T. 827; 25 W. R. 117 | 539 |
| Nunn <i>v.</i> Fabian, L. R. 1 Ch. 35 | 361 |
| Nutton <i>v.</i> Wilson, 22 Q. B. D. 744; 58 L. J. Q. B. 443; 37 W. R. 522; 53 J. P. 644 | 394 |

O.

| | |
|--|---------|
| Oakes <i>v.</i> Turquand, L. R. 2 H. L. 325; 36 L. J. Ch. 949; 16 L. T. 808 | 292 |
| O'Connor <i>v.</i> Bradshaw, 5 Ex. 882; 20 L. J. Ex. 26 | 162 |
| Odell, <i>Ex parte</i> , 10 Ch. D. 76; 48 L. J. Bkey. 1; 39 L. T. 333; 27 W. R. 274 | 161 |
| O'Flaherty <i>v.</i> McDowell, 6 H. L. 179 | 29, 226 |
| Ogden <i>v.</i> Benas, L. R. 9 C. P. 513; 43 L. J. C. P. 259; 30 L. T. 683; 22 W. R. 805 | 153 |
| Ogilvy <i>v.</i> Foljambe, 3 Mer. 53 | 53 |
| Oldfield <i>v.</i> Dodd, 8 Ex. 578; 22 L. J. Ex. 144; 17 Jur. 261 | 334 |
| Oliver <i>v.</i> N. E. Ry. Co., L. R. 9 Q. B. 409; 43 L. J. Q. B. 198 | 509 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxxxiii

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| O'Loghlen, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 6 Ch. 406; 40 L. J. Bkcy. 18; 23 L. T. 878; 19 W. R. 459 | 204, 267 |
| Onslow v. Inland Revenue, 25 Q. B. D. 465; 59 L. J. Q. B. 556; 63 L. T. 513; 38 W. R. 728 & [1891] 1 Q. B. 239; 60 L. J. Q. B. 138; 64 L. T. 211; 39 W. R. 373 | 76, 405 |
| Oram v. Brearey, 2 Ex. D. 348; 46 L. J. Ex. 481; 36 L. T. 475; 25 W. R. 695 | 180 |
| O'Reilly v. Thompson, 2 Cox Eq. Cas. 273 | 361 |
| Oriental Bank v. Wright, 5 App. Cas. 842; 50 L. J. P. C. 1; 43 L. T. 177 | 402 |
| Orme's Case, L. R. 8 C. P. 281; 42 L. J. C. P. 146; 28 L. T. 901; 21 W. R. 637 | 47 |
| Ornamental Wood v. Brown, 2 H. & C. 63; 32 L. J. Ex. 190; 9 Jur. N. S. 578; 8 L. T. 306; 11 W. R. 600 | 5 |
| Osborne v. Milman, 18 Q. B. D. 471; 56 L. J. Q. B. 263; 56 L. T. 808; 35 W. R. 397; 51 J. P. 427 | 574 |
| O'Shanassy v. Joashim, 1 App. Cas. 82; 45 L. J. P. C. 19; 34 L. T. 265; 24 W. R. 792 | 118 |
| Oswald v. Berwick, 3 E. & B. 653; 23 L. J. Q. B. 321; 1 Jur. N. S. 395 & 5 H. L. Cas. 856; 25 L. J. Q. B. 383; 2 Jur. N. S. 743 | 551 |
| Owen v. Body, 5 A. & E. 28; 2 H. & W. 31; 6 N. & M. 448 | 444 |
| — v. Burnett, 2 Cr. & M. 335; 4 Tyr. 133 | 66 |
| — v. Saunders, 1 Ld. Raym. 158 | 222 |
| Owens v. Woosman, L. R. 3 Q. B. 469; 37 L. J. Q. B. 159; 18 L. T. 357; 16 W. R. 932; 9 B. & S. 243 | 237, 260 |
| Oxford v. Wildgoose, 3 Lev. 293 | 46 |

P.

| | |
|--|----------|
| Pacific, The, 33 L. J. P. M. & A. 120; B. & L. 243; 10 Jur. N. S. 1111; 10 L. T. 541 | 77 |
| Padstow Assur. Assoc., <i>Re</i> , 20 Ch. D. 137; 51 L. J. Ch. 344; 45 L. T. 774; 30 W. R. 326 | 444, 556 |
| Page, <i>Re</i> , 2 Ch. D. 323; 45 L. J. Bk. 1; 34 L. T. 638; 24 W. R. 502 | 172 |
| — v. Bennett, 2 Giff. 117; 29 L. J. Ch. 398; 6 Jur. N. S. 419; 8 W. R. 339 | 308 |
| — v. Pearce, 8 M. & W. 677 | 488 |
| Paget v. Foley, 2 Bing. N. C. 679; 3 Scott 120; 2 Hodges 32 | 233 |
| Pain v. Boughtwood, 24 Q. B. D. 353; 59 L. J. M. C. 45; 62 L. T. 284; 38 W. R. 428; 54 J. P. 469; 16 Cox C. C. 747 | 104, 143 |
| Painter v. Liverpool Gas Co., 3 A. & E. 433; 6 N. & M. 736; 2 H. & W. 233 | 513 |

f 2

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Pallister <i>v.</i> Gravesend, 9 C. B. 774 | 422, 566 |
| Palmer's Case, 1 Leach 393 | 46 |
| — Trade Mark, <i>In re</i> , 21 Ch. D. 47; 51 L. J. Ch. 673; 46 L. T. 787; 46 J. P. 772 | 287 |
| — <i>v.</i> Metrop. Ry. Co., 31 L. J. Q. B. 259 | 547 |
| — <i>v.</i> Thatcher, 3 Q. B. D. 346; 47 L. J. M. C. 58; 37 L. T. 784; 26 W. R. 314 | 7, 232 |
| Pape <i>v.</i> Pape, 20 Q. B. D. 76; 57 L. J. M. C. 3; 58 L. T. 399; 36 W. R. 125; 52 J. P. 181 | 374 |
| Paradine <i>v.</i> Jane, Aleyn 26 | 541 |
| Parbury, <i>Ex parte</i> , 3 De G. F. & J. 80; 30 L. J. Ch. 513; 7 Jur. N. S. 503; 4 L. T. 62; 9 W. R. 470 | 13, 291 |
| Pardo <i>v.</i> Bingham, L. R. 4 Ch. 735; 39 L. J. Ch. 170; 20 L. T. 464; 17 W. R. 419 | 313 |
| Park Gate Iron Co. <i>v.</i> Coates, L. R. 5 C. P. 634; 39 L. J. C. P. 317; 22 L. T. 658; 18 W. R. 928 | 547, 549, 550 |
| Parker, <i>Re</i> , 21 Ch. D. 408; 52 L. J. Ch. 159; 47 L. T. 633; 31 W. R. 212; 47 J. P. 36, 516 | 557 |
| — <i>v.</i> G. W. Ry. Co., 7 M. & G. 253; 7 Scott N. R. 835; 13 L. J. C. P. 105; 8 Jur. 194 | 420 |
| — <i>v.</i> Inge, 17 Q. B. D. 584; 55 L. J. M. C. 149; 55 L. T. 300; 51 J. P. 20 | 444 |
| — <i>v.</i> Taswell, 2 De G. & J. 559; 27 L. J. Ch. 812 | 457 |
| Parkyn <i>v.</i> Preist, 7 Q. B. D. 313; 50 L. J. M. C. 148; 50 L. J. Q. B. 648; 30 W. R. 13; 45 J. P. 751 | 382 |
| Parlement Belge, <i>The</i> , 5 P. D. 197; 42 L. T. 273; 28 W. R. 642 | 201 |
| Parry <i>v.</i> Croydon Gas Co., 15 C. B. N. S. 568; 9 L. T. 694; 12 W. R. 212 | 253, 261, 402 |
| Parsons <i>v.</i> Bethnal Green, L. R. 3 C. P. 56; 37 L. J. C. P. 62; 17 L. T. 211; 16 W. R. 85 | 582 |
| — <i>v.</i> Brand, 25 Q. B. D. 110; 59 L. J. Q. B. 189; 62 L. T. 479; 38 W. R. 388 | 11 |
| Partheriche <i>v.</i> Mason, 2 Chit. 658 | 506 |
| Partington <i>v.</i> Attorney-Gen., L. R. 4 H. L. 122 | 402 |
| Parton <i>v.</i> Williams, 3 B. & Ald. 330 | 325 |
| Partridge <i>v.</i> Mallandine, 18 Q. B. D. 276; 56 L. J. Q. B. 251; 56 L. T. 203; 35 W. R. 276 | 444 |
| — <i>v.</i> Naylor, Cro. Eliz. 480 | 275, 277, 577 |
| Pascal, <i>Ex parte</i> , 1 Ch. D. 509; 45 L. J. Bkcy. 81; 34 L. T. 10; 24 W. R. 263 | 203 |
| Patent Bread Co., <i>Re</i> , L. R. 7 Ch. 289; 26 L. T. 228; 20 W. R. 347 | 537 |
| Patorni <i>v.</i> Campbell, 12 M. & W. | 207 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxxxv

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| <i>Patten v. Rhymer</i> , 3 E. & E. 1; 29 L. J. M. C. 189; 6 Jur. N. S. 1030; 2 L. T. 352; 8 W. R. 496 | 272, 281 |
| <i>Patterson v. Patterson</i> , 2 P. & M. 189; 40 L. J. Mat. 5; 23 L. T. 568; 19 W. R. 232 | 78 |
| <i>Patteson v. Banks</i> , Cowp. 543 | 63 |
| <i>Paxton v. Popham</i> , 9 East 408 | 559 |
| <i>Payne, Ex parte</i> , 5 D. & L. 679; 18 L. J. Q. B. 197; 13 Jur. 634 | 181, 246 |
| — <i>v. Thomas</i> , 60 L. J. M. C. 3; 63 L. T. 456; 54 J. P. 824 | 17 |
| <i>Peacock v. Reg.</i> , 4 C. B. N. S. 264; 27 L. J. C. P. 224 | 490, 550 |
| <i>Pearce v. Scotcher</i> , 9 Q. B. D. 162; 46 L. T. 342; 46 J. P. 248 | 147 |
| <i>Pearse v. Morrice</i> , 2 A. & E. 84; 4 N. & M. 48 | 297 |
| <i>Pearson, Re</i> , [1892] 2 Q. B. 263; 61 L. J. Q. B. 585; 67 L. T. 367; 40 W. R. 532; 9 M. B. R. 185 | 204 |
| — <i>v. Holborn Union</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 389; 62 L. J. M. C. 77; 68 L. T. 351; 57 J. P. 169 | 188 |
| — <i>v. Hull</i> , 3 H. & C. 921; 35 L. J. M. C. 36; 13 L. T. 180 | 378, 477 |
| — <i>v. Kingston</i> , 3 H. & C. 921; 35 L. J. M. C. 36; 13 L. T. 180 | 378, 477 |
| <i>Pease v. Chaytor</i> , 3 B. & S. 620; 32 L. J. M. C. 121; 9 Jur. N. S. 664; 8 L. T. 613; 11 W. R. 563 | 490 |
| — <i>v. Norwood</i> , L. R. 4 C. P. 235; 38 L. J. C. P. 161; 17 W. R. 320 | 490 |
| <i>Peate v. Dicken</i> , 1 C. M. & R. 422; 5 Tyr. 116 | 469 |
| <i>Peek v. N. Staffordshire Ry.</i> , 10 H. L. Cas. 473; 32 L. J. Q. B. 241; 9 Jur. N. S. 914; 8 L. T. 768; 11 W. R. 1023 | 417 |
| <i>Peerless, The</i> , 1 Q. B. 153 | 113 |
| <i>Pelham v. Pickersgill</i> , 1 T. R. 660; 1 R. R. 348 | 572 |
| <i>Pellow v. Wonford</i> , 9 B. & C. 135; 4 M. & R. 130 | 9, 487 |
| <i>Pender v. Lushington</i> , 6 Ch. D. 70; 46 L. J. Ch. 317 | 166 |
| <i>Pendlebury v. Greenhalgh</i> , 1 Q. B. D. 36; 45 L. J. Q. B. 3; 33 L. T. 472; 34 W. R. 98 | 584 |
| <i>Penn v. Alexander</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 522; 62 L. J. M. C. 65; 68 L. T. 355; 41 W. R. 392; 17 Cox C. C. 815; 57 J. P. 118 | 93 |
| <i>Penny v. S. E. Ry. Co.</i> , 7 E. & B. 660; 26 L. J. Q. B. 225; 5 Jur. N. S. 957 | 180 |
| <i>Penstred v. Payer</i> , Duke on Charitable Uses, p. 381 | 39 |
| <i>People, The, v. Tibbetts</i> , 4 Cowen 392 | 314 |
| — <i>v. Utica Insur. Co.</i> , 15 Johns. N. Y. Rep. 389 | 59, 71 |
| <i>Peppin v. Cooper</i> , 2 B. & A. 431 | 237 |
| <i>Perchard v. Heywood</i> , 8 T. R. 468 | 419 |
| <i>Perkins, Re</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 613; 59 L. J. Q. B. 226; 38 W. R. 710; 2 Meg. 197; 7 M. B. R. 32 | 287 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Perkins v. Sewell</i> , 1 W. Bl. 659 | 63 |
| <i>Perks v. Severn</i> , 7 East 194 ; 3 Smith 339 | 368 |
| <i>Perring v. Trail</i> , L. R. 18 Eq. 88; 43 L. J. Ch. 775; 30 L. T. 248; 22 W. R. 572 | 511 |
| <i>Perry v. Eames</i> , [1891] 1 Ch. 658; 60 L. J. Ch. 345; 64 L. T. 438; 39 W. R. 602 | 192 |
| — <i>v. Skinner</i> , 2 M. & W. 471; M. & H. 122; 1 Jur. 433 | 287, 305, 328 |
| <i>Peshall v. Layton</i> , 2 T. R. 712 | 282 |
| <i>Peters v. Cowie</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 131; 46 L. J. M. C. 177; 36 L. T. 107 | 116 |
| — <i>v. Sheehan</i> , 10 M. & W. 213; 1 D. N. S. 943; 6 Jur. 739; 12 L. J. Ex. 177 | 550 |
| <i>Peto v. West Ham</i> , 2 E. & E. 144; 28 L. J. M. C. 240; 5 Jur. N. S. 1209; 7 W. R. 586 | 459 |
| <i>Pettamberdass v. Thakoorseydass</i> , 7 Moo. P. C. 239; 5 Moo. Ind. App. 109; 15 Jur. 257 | 301 |
| <i>Pharmaceutical Society v. Armson</i> , [1894] 2 Q. B. 720; 64 L. J. Q. B. 32; 71 L. T. 315; 42 W. R. 662; 59 J. P. 52 | 447 |
| — <i>v. London Supply Assoc.</i> , 5 App. Cas. 857; 49 L. J. Q. B. 736; 43 L. T. 389; 28 W. R. 957; 45 J. P. 20 | 85, 460 |
| — <i>v. Piper & Co.</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 686; 62 L. J. Q. B. 305; 68 L. T. 490; 41 W. R. 447; 57 J. P. 502 | 447 |
| — <i>v. Wheeldon</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 683; 59 L. J. Q. B. 400; 62 L. T. 727; 54 J. P. 407 | 106 |
| <i>Phillipp's Charity, Re</i> , 9 Jur. 959 | 515 |
| <i>Phillips, Re</i> , 30 L. J. Bkcy. 1 | 159 |
| — <i>v. Clark</i> , 2 C. B. N. S. 156; 26 L. J. C. P. 186; 3 Jur. N. S. 467; 5 Jur. N. S. 1081 | 286 |
| — <i>v. Eyre</i> , L. R. 6 Q. B. 1; 40 L. J. Q. B. 28; 10 B. & S. 1004 | 299 |
| — <i>v. Goff</i> , 17 Q. B. D. 805; 55 L. J. Q. B. 512; 35 W. R. 197; 50 J. P. 614 | 532 |
| — <i>v. Hopwood</i> , 10 B. & C. 39; 5 M. & R. 15 | 585 |
| — <i>v. Hunter</i> , 2 H. Bl. 402; 4 T. R. 182; 2 R. R. 353 | 205 |
| — <i>v. Poland</i> , L. R. 1 C. P. 204; 35 L. J. C. P. 128; 12 Jur. N. S. 260 | 278 |
| — <i>v. Rees</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 17; 59 L. J. Q. B. 400; 61 L. T. 713; 38 W. R. 53; 54 J. P. 293 | 34 |
| <i>Philpott v. St. George's Hospital</i> , 6 H. L. 338; 27 L. J. Ch. 72; 3 Jur. N. S. 1269 | 158, 163, 167 |
| <i>Philpotts v. Philpotts</i> , 10 C. B. 85 | 126, 293 |
| <i>Philps v. Winchcomb</i> , 3 Bulstr. 77 | 102 |
| <i>Phipson v. Harvett</i> , 1 C. M. & R. 473; 5 Tyr. 54 | 225, 254 |
| <i>Phoenix Bessemer Co., Re</i> , 45 L. J. Ch. 11; 33 L. T. 403; 24 W. R. 19 | 303, 317 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxxxvii

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Pickard <i>v.</i> Marriage, 1 Ex. D. 364; 45 L. J. Ex. 594; 35 L. T. 343; 24 W. R. 88 | 161 |
| Pickering <i>v.</i> Ilfracombe Ry. Co., L. R. 3 C. P. 235; 37 L. J. C. P. 118; 16 L. T. 650; 16 W. R. 458 | 565 |
| — <i>v.</i> James, L. R. 8 C. P. 489; 42 L. J. C. P. 217; 21 W. R. 786; 29 L. T. 210 | 510, 576 |
| — <i>v.</i> Marsh, 43 L. J. M. C. 143; 22 W. R. 798 | 267 |
| — <i>v.</i> Noyes, 4 B. & C. 639; 7 D. & R. 49 | 436 |
| Pickup <i>v.</i> Wharton, 2 Cr. & M. 405 | 316 |
| Pictou (Municipality) <i>v.</i> Geldert, [1893] A. C. 524; 69 L. T. 510; 42 W. R. 114 | 584 |
| Pierce <i>v.</i> Hopper, 1 Stra. 249 | 13, 184 |
| Piggott <i>v.</i> Rush, 4 A. & E. 912; 6 N. & M. 376; 2 H. & W. 29 | 360 |
| Pike <i>v.</i> Hoare, Eden 184 | 5 |
| — <i>v.</i> Nicholas, L. R. 5 Ch. 251; 39 L. J. Ch. 435; 18 W. R. 321 | 272 |
| Pilcher <i>v.</i> Stafford, 4 B. & S. 775; 33 L. J. M. C. 113; 10 Jur. N. S. 651; 9 L. T. 759; 12 W. R. 407 | 395 |
| Pilkington <i>v.</i> Cooke, 16 M. & W. 615 | 232 |
| Pinhorn <i>v.</i> Sonster, 8 Ex. 138; 22 L. J. Ex. 18 | 316, 317 |
| Pinkerton <i>v.</i> Easton, L. R. 16 Eq. 490; 42 L. J. Ch. 878; 29 L. T. 364; 21 W. R. 943 | 18 |
| Pitman <i>v.</i> Maddox, 2 Salk. 690 | 434 |
| Pitt <i>v.</i> Shew, 4 B. & A. 208 | 356 |
| Pitts <i>v.</i> Millar, L. R. 9 Q. B. 380; 43 L. J. M. C. 96; 30 L. T. 77, 377 | 328 |
| Planché <i>v.</i> Braham, 4 Bing. N. C. 17; 8 C. & P. 68; 5 Scott 242; 3 Hodges 288; 1 Jur. 823 | 272 |
| Plant <i>v.</i> Potts, [1891] 1 Q. B. 256; 60 L. J. Q. B. 33; 63 L. T. 730; 55 J. P. 277; 1 Fox 206 | 329 |
| Plasterers' Co. <i>v.</i> Parish Clerks' Co., 6 Ex. 630; 20 L. J. Ex. 362; 15 Jur. 965 | 5 |
| Platt <i>v.</i> Lock, Plowd. 35 | 358 |
| — <i>v.</i> Sheriffs of London, Plowd. 36 | 243 |
| Plumstead Bd. of Works <i>v.</i> Spackman, 13 Q. B. D. 878; 53 L. J. M. C. 142; 51 L. T. 760; 49 J. P. 132 | 278 |
| Pochin <i>v.</i> Duncombe, 1 H. & N. 842 | 425 |
| Pointon <i>v.</i> Hill, 12 Q. B. D. 306; 53 L. J. M. C. 62; 50 L. T. 268; 32 W. R. 478; 48 J. P. 341; 15 Cox C. C. 461 | 377 |
| Poland, <i>Re</i> , L. R. 1 Ch. 356; 14 L. T. 502; 12 Jur. 425; 35 L. J. Bkcy. 19 | 87, 278 |
| Pollard, <i>Re</i> , L. R. 2 P. C. 106; 5 Moo. P. C. C. N. S. 111 | 512 |
| Pollock <i>v.</i> Lands Imp. Co., 37 Ch. Div. 661; 57 L. J. Ch. 853; 58 L. T. 374; 36 W. R. 617 | 242 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Pommery v. Apthorpe, 56 L. J. Q. B. 155; 56 L. T. 24; 35 W. R. 307 | 207 |
| Ponsford v. Walton, L. R. 3 C. P. 167; 37 L. J. C. P. 113; 17 L. T. 511; 16 W. R. 363 | 155 |
| Pope v. Tearle, L. R. 9 C. P. 499; 43 L. J. M. C. 129; 30 L. T. 789; 22 W. R. 950 | 450 |
| Porter v. Bradley, 3 T. R. 143; 1 R. R. 675 | 447 |
| Portingell, <i>Ex parte</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 15; 61 L. J. M. C. 1; 65 L. T. 603; 40 W. R. 102; 56 J. P. 276 | 40 |
| Portsmouth (Mayor of) v. Smith, 10 App. Cas. 364; 54 L. J. Q. B. 473; 53 L. T. 394; 49 J. P. 676 | 46 |
| Postmaster v. Early, 12 Wheat. 148 | 441, 442 |
| Postmaster-General, <i>Ex parte</i> , 10 Ch. D. 595; 48 L. J. Bkcy. 84; 40 L. T. 16; 27 W. R. 325 | 190, 192 |
| Potter v. Duffield, L. R. 18 Eq. 4; 43 L. J. Ch. 472; 22 W. R. 585 | 410 |
| — v. Newman, 2 C. M. & R. 742; 4 D. P. C. 504; 1 T. & G. 29 | 107 |
| Poulsum v. Thirst, L. R. 2 C. P. 449; 36 L. J. C. P. 225; 16 L. T. 324; 15 W. R. 766 | 101 |
| Poulterers' Co. v. Phillips, 6 Bing. N. C. 314; 4 Jur. 124 | 278 |
| Powdrell v. Jones, 2 Sm. & G. 407; 24 L. J. Ch. 123; 8 Jur. 1111 | 41 |
| Powell v. Boraston, 18 C. B. N. S. 175; 1 H. & P. 179; 34 L. J. C. P. 73; 11 Jur. N. S. 160; 11 L. T. 734; 13 W. R. 465 | 474 |
| — v. Fall, 5 Q. B. D. 597; 49 L. J. Q. B. 428; 43 L. T. 562 503, 506 | 506 |
| — v. Guest, 18 C. B. N. S. 72; 10 Jur. N. S. 1238; 13 W. R. 274; 33 L. J. C. P. 69; 1 H. & P. 149; 11 L. T. 599 | 90 |
| Preece v. Pulley, 49 L. J. C. P. 686 | 416 |
| Prentice v. London, L. R. 10 C. P. 679; 44 L. J. C. P. 353; 33 L. T. 251; 25 W. R. 695 | 124, 182 |
| Prices of Wine, The, Hob. 215 | 435 |
| Prince v. U. S., 2 Gallison 204 | 303 |
| Pritchard v. Arbouin, 3 Russ. 456 | 163 |
| Proctor v. Manwaring, 3 B. & A. 145 | 230, 370, 394 |
| Protector, The, 1 W. Rob. 45 | 412 |
| Pryce v. Monmouth Canal Co., 4 App. Cas. 197; 49 L. J. Ex. 130; 40 L. T. 630; 27 W. R. 666 | 402 |
| Pugsley & Co. v. Ropkins & Co., [1892] 1 Q. B. 273; 61 L. J. Q. B. 645; 67 L. T. 369; 40 W. R. 596 | 186 |
| Pulborough School Board, <i>Re</i> , [1894] 1 Q. B. 725; 63 L. J. Q. B. 497; 70 L. T. 639; 42 W. R. 388; 58 J. P. 572; 1 Manson 172 | 299, 304, 310 |
| Pulbrook, <i>Ex parte</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 86; 61 L. J. M. C. 91; 66 L. T. 159; 40 W. R. 175; 56 J. P. 293; 17 Cox C. C. 464 | 101 |
| Purdy v. Smith, 1 E. & E. 511; 5 Jur. N. S. 912; 28 L. J. M. C. 150 | 432 |

TABLE OF CASES.

lxxxix

Q.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Quartz Hill Co., <i>Re</i> , 21 Ch. D. 642; 51 L. J. Ch. 940; 31 W. R. 173 | 81 |
| Quilter v. Mapleson, 9 Q. B. D. 672; 52 L. J. Q. B. 44; 47 L. T. 562; 31 W. R. 75 | 308 |
| Quinton v. Mayor of Bristol, L. R. 17 Eq. 524; 43 L. J. Ch. 783; 30 L. T. 112; 22 W. R. 434 | 422 |

R.

| | |
|--|------------|
| Radcliffe v. Bartholomew, [1892] 1 Q. B. 161; 61 L. J. M. C. 63; 65 L. T. 677; 40 W. R. 63; 56 J. P. 262 | 487 |
| Radnorshire Bd. v. Evans, 3 B. & S. 400; 32 L. J. M. C. 100; 9 Jur. N. S. 890; 7 L. T. 677 | 471 |
| Raeburn v. Andrews, L. R. 9 Q. B. 118; 43 L. J. Q. B. 73; 30 L. T. 15; 22 W. R. 489 | 496 |
| Railton v. Wood, 15 App. Cas. 363; 59 L. J. P. C. 84; 63 L. T. 13 | 123, 278 |
| Railway Sleepers Co., <i>Re</i> , 29 Ch. D. 204; 54 L. J. Ch. 720; 52 L. T. 731; 33 W. R. 595 | 487 |
| Ramsden v. Lupton, L. R. 9 Q. B. 17; 43 L. J. Q. B. 17; 29 L. T. 510; 22 W. R. 129 | 170 |
| Ramshay, <i>Ex parte</i> , 21 L. J. Q. B. 238; 18 Q. B. 173; 16 Jur. 684 | 512 |
| Randleson, <i>Ex parte</i> , 1 Mont. & M'Arth. 86 | 162 |
| Randolph v. Milman, L. R. 4 C. P. 107; 38 L. J. C. P. 81; 17 W. R. 262 | 400 |
| Rapier v. London Tramways Co., [1893] 2 Ch. 588; 63 L. J. Ch. 36; 69 L. T. 361 | 505 |
| Rashleigh, <i>Ex parte</i> , 2 Ch. D. 9; 45 L. J. Bkcy. 29; 34 L. T. 193; 24 W. R. 495 | 312, 319 |
| Rawley v. Rawley, 1 Q. B. D. 466; 45 L. J. Q. B. 675; 35 L. T. 191; 24 W. R. 995 | 57, 78, 81 |
| Rayson v. South London Tramways Co., [1893] 2 Q. B. 304; 62 L. J. Q. B. 593; 69 L. T. 491; 42 W. R. 21 | 71 |
| Read v. Anderson, 13 Q. B. D. 779; 53 L. J. Q. B. 532; 51 L. T. 55; 32 W. R. 590; 49 J. P. 4 | 159, 558 |
| — v. Bp. of Lincoln, [1892] A. C. 644; 62 L. J. P. C. 1; 67 L. T. 128; 56 J. P. 725 | 33 |
| — v. Edwards, 17 C. B. N. S. 245; 34 L. J. C. P. 31; 11 L. T. 311 | 451 |
| — v. Johannon, 25 Q. B. D. 300; 59 L. J. Q. B. 544; 63 L. T. 387; 38 W. R. 734 | 45 |
| — v. Story, 30 L. J. M. C. 110; 6 H. & N. 433 | 217, 435 |
| Readshaw v. Balders, 4 Taunt. 57 | 566 |

| | PAGE |
|--|--------------------|
| Rebeckah, The, 1 C. Rob. 230 | 420 |
| Receiver of Police D. v. Bell, L. R. 7 Q. B. 433 ; 41 L. J. M. C. 153 | 254 |
| Rede v. Farr, 6 M. & S. 121 | 290 |
| Redfern, <i>Re</i> , 6 Ch. D. 133 | 351 |
| — v. —, [1891] P. 139 ; 60 L. J. P. 9 ; 64 L. T. 68 ; 39 W. R. 212 ; 55 J. P. 37 | 126 |
| Redgate v. Haynes, 1 Q. B. D. 89 ; 45 L. J. M. C. 65 ; 33 L. T. 779 | 389 |
| Reece v. Miller, 8 Q. B. D. 626 ; 51 L. J. M. C. 64 | 138 |
| Reed v. Ingham, 3 E. & B. 889 ; 2 C. L. R. 1495 ; 23 L. J. M. C. 156 ; 1 Jur. N. S. 61 | 411, 471 |
| — v. Nutt, 24 Q. B. D. 669 ; 59 L. J. Q. B. 311 ; 62 L. T. 635 ; 38 W. R. 621 ; 54 J. P. 599 | 281 |
| — v. Wiggins, 13 C. B. N. S. 220 ; 32 L. J. C. P. 131 ; 7 L. T. 423 ; 11 W. R. 148 | 303 |
| Reeve v. Gibson, [1891] 1 Q. B. 652 ; 60 L. J. Q. B. 451 ; 64 L. T. 141 ; 39 W. R. 420 | 244 |
| Reeves v. White, 17 Q. B. 995 ; 21 L. J. Q. B. 170 ; 16 Jur. 637 . | 181 |
| — v. Yeates, 1 H. & C. 435 ; 31 L. J. M. C. 241 ; 10 W. R. 779 | 374 |
| Regent U. S. Stores, <i>Re</i> , 8 Ch. D. 75 ; 38 L. T. 84 ; 26 W. R. 425 | 547 |
| Reid v. Croft, 5 Bing. N. C. 68 | 536 |
| — v. Reid, 31 Ch. D. 402 ; 55 L. J. Ch. 294 ; 54 L. T. 100 ; 34 W. R. 332 | 298, 303 |
| Rein v. Lane, L. R. 2 Q. B. 144 ; 8 B. & S. 83 | 404 |
| Remington v. Stevens, 2 Stra. 1271 | 78 |
| Rendell v. Blair, 45 Ch. D. 139 ; 59 L. J. Ch. 641 ; 63 L. T. 265 ; 38 W. R. 689 | 400 |
| Restall v. London and S. W. Ry. Co., L. R. 3 Ex. 141 ; 37 L. J. Ex. 89 ; 18 L. T. 331 ; 16 W. R. 872 | 587 |
| R. v. Abbot, Doug. 553 | 180, 254 |
| — Adams, 22 Q. B. D. 66 ; 58 L. J. M. C. 1 ; 59 L. T. 903 ; 53 J. P. 377 ; 16 Cox C. C. 544 | 388, 399 |
| — Adamson, 1 Q. B. D. 201 ; 45 L. J. M. C. 46 ; 33 L. T. 840 ; 24 W. R. 250 | 335, 347, 348, 349 |
| — Adlard, 4 B. & C. 772 | 89 |
| — Aiken, 3 Burr. 1785 | 547 |
| — Aldborough, 13 Q. B. 190 | 517 |
| — Allan, 4 B. & S. 915 ; 33 L. J. M. C. 98 ; 10 Jur. N. S. 796 ; 9 L. T. 761 ; 12 W. R. 422 | 542 |
| — Allday, 7 E. & B. 799 ; 26 L. J. Q. B. 292 ; 3 Jur. N. S. 961 | 497 |
| — Allen, 15 East 333 | 190 |
| — —, L. R. 1 C. C. 367 ; 41 L. J. M. C. 97 ; 26 L. T. 664 ; 20 W. R. 756 ; 12 Cox C. C. 193 | 446 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xci

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| R. v. Allendale, 3 T. R. 382 | 165 |
| — All Saints (Derby), 13 East 143 | 416 |
| — — (Wigan), 1 App. Cas. 611; 35 L. T. 381; 25 W. R. 128 | 284 |
| — Ampthill, 2 B. & C. 847 | 542 |
| — Anderson, L. R. 1 C. C. 161; 38 L. J. M. C. 12; 19 L. T. 400; 17 W. R. 208; 11 Cox C. C. 198 | 201 |
| — Anglesey JJ., [1892] 2 Q. B. 29; 61 L. J. M. C. 143; 67 L. T. 322; 56 J. P. 440 | 526 |
| — Arkwright, 12 Q. B. 960; 18 L. J. Q. B. 26; 13 Jur. 300 | 528 |
| — Armagh, Archbishop of, Stra. 516 | 193 |
| — Armitage, L. R. 7 Q. B. 773; 42 L. J. M. C. 15; 27 L. T. 41; 20 W. R. 1015 | 12, 544 |
| — Ashburton, 8 Q. B. 871 | 19 |
| — Astley, 4 Doug. 389 | 164 |
| — Aston, 1 L. M. & P. 491; 4 New Sess. Cas. 283; 19 L. J. M. C. 236; 14 Jur. 1045 | 488, 543 |
| — Athos, 8 Mod. Rep. 144 | 64, 70 |
| — Atkins, 3 Burr. 1706 | 569 |
| — Audly, Salk. 526 | 173 |
| — Bacon, 11 Cox 540 | 395 |
| — Badger, 6 E. & B. 137; 25 L. J. M. C. 81; 2 Jur. N. S. 419 | 127, 137 |
| — Bailey, R. & R. C. C. 1 | 595 |
| — Baines, 2 Lord Raym. 1267 | 184 |
| — —, 12 A. & E. 227; 4 P. & D. 362; 5 Jur. 337 | 217 |
| — Ball, 6 C. & P. 563 | 65 |
| — Balme, 2 Cowp. 648 | 568 |
| — Banbury, 1 A. & E. 142; 3 N. & M. 292 | 4 |
| — Bank of England, [1891] 1 Q. B. 785; 60 L. J. Q. B. 497; 64 L. T. 468; 39 W. R. 558; 55 J. P. 695 | 125 |
| — Barclay, 8 Q. B. D. 306; 51 L. J. M. C. 27; 46 L. T. 102; 30 W. R. 472; 46 J. P. 167 & 8 Q. B. D. 480; 51 L. J. M. C. 47; 46 L. T. 335; 30 W. R. 672 & 46 J. P. 693 | 402 |
| — Barham, 8 B. & C. 99 | 6 |
| — Barlow, Carth. 293 | 335, 349 |
| — —, 2 Salk. 609 | 569 |
| — Barnet Sanitary Auth., 1 Q. B. D. 558; 45 L. J. M. C. 105; 35 L. T. 362 | 9 |
| — Barret, 1 Salk. 383 | 547 |
| — Bateman, 8 E. & B. 584; 4 Jur. N. S. 301; 27 L. J. M. C. 95 | 61, 71 |
| — Baudé, Cro. Jac. 41 | 371 |
| — Bawbergh, 2 B. & C. 222; 3 D. & R. 338 | 297 |
| — Beadle, 26 L. J. M. C. 111; 7 E. & B. 492; 3 Jur. N. S. 863 | 190 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| R. v. Beany, R. & R. 416 | 371 |
| — Beecham, 5 Cox 181 | 397 |
| — Bellamy, 1 B. & C. 500 | 9 |
| — Belton, 11 Q. B. 388 ; 3 New Sess. Cas. 77 ; 17 L. J. M. C. 70 | 415, 544 |
| — Berkeley, 1 Ken. 80 | 190 |
| — Berks, 4 Q. B. D. 469 ; 48 L. J. M. C. 137 ; 27 W. R. 798 | 488 |
| — Berry, 28 L. J. M. C. 86 ; 5 Jur. N. S. 320 ; 32 L. T. O. S. 323 ; 7 W. R. 229 ; 1 Bell C. C. 46 | 547 |
| — Bertrand, L. R. 1 P. C. 520 ; 36 L. J. P. C. 51 ; 16 L. T. 752 ; 16 W. R. 9 ; 4 Moore P. C. C. N. S. 460 | 549 |
| — Beverley Gas Co., 6 A. & E. 645 | 85 |
| — Bewdley, 1 P. Wms. 223 | 430 |
| — Bigg, 3 P. Wms. 434 ; 2 East P. C. 882 | 71 |
| — Birmingham, 8 Q. B. 410 | 82 |
| — —, 8 B. & C. 29 | 164 |
| — Bishop, 5 Q. B. D. 259 ; 14 Cox C. C. 404 ; 49 L. J. M. C. 45 ; 42 L. T. 240 ; 44 J. P. 330 ; 28 W. R. 475 | 143 |
| — Biswell, 2 Cox C. C. 279 | 387 |
| — Bjornsen, 34 L. J. M. C. 180 ; 10 Cox C. C. 74 ; L. & C. 545 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 589 ; 13 W. R. 664 ; 12 L. T. 473 | 202 |
| — Blane, 13 Q. B. 773 ; 3 New Sess. Cas. 597 ; 18 L. J. M. C. 216 ; 13 Jur. 854 | 33, 211 |
| — Bleasdale, 4 T. R. 809 | 275 |
| — Bloomsbury C. C. Judge, 17 Q. B. D. 778 ; 55 L. J. Q. B. 443 & 56 L. T. 321 ; 51 J. P. 212 | 542 |
| — Bloxham, 6 Q. B. 528 ; 1 New Sess. Cas. 370 ; 2 D. & L. 168 ; 8 Jur. 1117 | 549 |
| — Blues, 5 E. & B. 291 | 415 |
| — Boiler Explosion Commrs., [1891] 1 Q. B. 703 ; 60 L. J. Q. B. 544 ; 64 L. T. 674 ; 39 W. R. 440 | 99 |
| — Bond, 6 A. & E. 905 | 525 |
| — Boteler, 33 L. J. M. C. 101 ; 4 B. & S. 959 ; 12 W. R. 466 | 348 |
| — Boulton, 4 A. & E. 498 ; 6 N. & M. 26 | 190 |
| — Boulton, 1 Den. C. C. 508 ; 2 C. & K. 517 ; 3 Cox C. C. 576 ; 19 L. J. M. C. 67 ; 13 Jur. 1034 | 397 |
| — Bowerman, [1891] 1 Q. B. 112 ; 60 L. J. M. C. 13 ; 63 L. T. 532 ; 39 W. R. 207 ; 55 J. P. 373 ; 17 Cox C. C. 151 | 375 |
| — Bowyer, 4 C. & P. 559 | 386 |
| — Brackenridge, L. R. 1 C. C. 133 ; 37 L. J. M. C. 86 ; 18 L. T. 369 ; 16 W. R. 816 ; 11 Cox C. C. 96 | 267 |
| — Bradford, Bell C. C. 268 ; 8 Cox C. C. 309 ; 29 L. J. M. C. 171 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 1102 ; 2 L. T. 392 ; 8 W. R. 531 | 389 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xciii

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| <i>R. v. Bradford Navigation</i> , 6 B. & S. 631 ; 34 L. J. Q. B. 191 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 769 ; 13 W. R. 892 | 506 |
| — <i>Bradlaugh</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 569 ; 46 L. J. M. C. 286 and 3 Q. B. D. 607 ; 48 L. J. M. C. 5 | 269 |
| — <i>Bradshaw</i> , 2 E. & E. 836 ; 29 L. J. M. C. 176 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 629 ; 8 W. R. 435 | 266 |
| — <i>Brice</i> , R. & R. 450 | 387 |
| — <i>Bridge</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 609 ; 59 L. J. M. C. 49 ; 62 L. T. 297 ; 38 W. R. 464 ; 54 J. P. 629 ; 17 Cox C. C. 66 | 252 |
| — <i>Bridgewater</i> , Cowp. 139 | 115 |
| — —, 3 T. R. 550 | 165 |
| — <i>Bridgnorth</i> , 10 A. & E. 66 ; 2 P. & D. 317 ; 3 Jur. 384 | 165 |
| — <i>Brighton</i> , 1 B. & S. 447 ; 30 L. J. M. C. 117 ; 5 L. T. 56 ; 9 W. R. 831 | 82 |
| — <i>Bristol Dock Co.</i> , 12 East 429 ; 11 R. R. 440 | 581 |
| — <i>Brittleton</i> , 12 Q. B. D. 266 ; 53 L. J. M. C. 83 ; 50 L. T. 276 ; 32 W. R. 463 ; 48 J. P. 295 ; 15 Cox C. C. 431 | 498 |
| — <i>Brodribb</i> , 6 C. & P. 571 | 65 |
| — <i>Brompton C. C. Judge</i> , 18 Q. B. D. 215 ; 13 App. Cas. 20 ; 57 L. J. Q. B. 387 ; 58 L. T. 1 ; 36 W. R. 742 ; 52 J. P. 228 | 516 |
| — <i>Brooks</i> , 2 C. & K. 402 | 79 |
| — <i>Brown</i> , 2 East P. C. 1007 | 374 |
| — —, 17 Q. B. 833 ; 21 L. J. M. C. 113 | 461 |
| — <i>Buchanan</i> , 8 Q. B. 883 ; 15 L. J. Q. B. 227 ; 10 Jur. 736 570, 573, 574 | 570, 573, 574 |
| — <i>Buck</i> , 2 Stra. 679 | 570 |
| — <i>Bucks</i> , 3 East 342 | 14 |
| — —, 2 E. & B. 447 ; 22 L. J. M. C. 139 ; 17 Jur. 530 ; 1 C. L. R. 443 | 227 |
| — <i>Burnaby</i> , 2 Lord Raym. 900. | 137 |
| — <i>Burslem Board</i> , 1 E. & E. 1077 ; 29 L. J. Q. B. 241 | 184 |
| — <i>Butler</i> , 1 W. Bl. 649 | 115 |
| — <i>Byrde</i> , 60 L. J. M. C. 17 ; 63 L. T. 645 ; 39 W. R. 171 ; 55 J. P. 310 ; 17 Cox C. C. 187 | 335 |
| — <i>Cambridge</i> , 4 A. & E. 111 ; 5 N. & M. 440 ; 1 H. & W. 600 180, 517 | 180, 517 |
| — —, 8 Dowl. 89 | 335, 347, 348 |
| — —, Stra. 557 | 511 |
| — <i>Canterbury, Abp.</i> , 11 Q. B. 483 ; 17 L. J. Q. B. 252 ; 12 Jur. 862 | 424 |
| — —, 1 E. & E. 545 ; 28 L. J. Q. B. 154 ; 5 Jur. N. S. 958 | 515 |
| — <i>Carew</i> , 20 L. J. M. C. 44 n. | 102 |
| — <i>Carlile</i> , 3 B. & Ald. 161 | 256 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| <i>R. v. Carnarvon</i> , 4 B. & Ald. 86 | 525 |
| —, 5 N. & M. 364 | 547 |
| — <i>Carpenter</i> , 6 A. & E. 794 ; W. W. & D. 329 ; 1 N. & P. 773 | 284 |
| — <i>Carr</i> , 10 Q. B. D. 76 ; 52 L. J. M. C. 12 ; 47 L. T. 451 ; 31 W. R. 121 ; 47 J. P. 38 ; 15 Cox C. C. 129 ; 4 Asp. M. C. 604 | 201 |
| — <i>Castro</i> , L. R. 9 Q. B. 360 ; 43 L. J. Q. B. 105 ; 30 L. T. 320 ; 22 W. R. 187 ; 1 Hopw. & C. 741 | 3 |
| — <i>Cator</i> , 4 Burr. 2026 | 258 |
| — <i>Champneys</i> , L. R. 6 C. P. 384 ; 40 L. J. C. P. 95 ; 24 L. T. 181 ; 19 W. R. 386 | 243 |
| — <i>Chantrell</i> , L. R. 10 Q. B. 587 ; 32 L. T. 305 | 3, 510 |
| — <i>Chapman</i> , 8 C. & P. 558 | 175 |
| — <i>Charles</i> , Burr. Set. O. 706 | 89 |
| — <i>Charlesworth</i> , 2 L. M. & P. 117 | 461 |
| — <i>Charretie</i> , 13 Q. B. 447 | 399 |
| — <i>Cheltenham</i> , 1 Q. B. 467 ; 1 G. & D. 167 | 114, 180 |
| — <i>Cheshire Lines Comm.</i> , L. R. 8 Q. B. 344 ; 42 L. J. M. C. 100 ; 28 L. T. 808 | 512 |
| — <i>Chichester (Bishop of)</i> , 29 L. J. Q. B. 23 ; 2 E. & E. 209 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 120 | 268, 340 |
| — <i>Child</i> , 4 C. & P. 442 | 372, 373 |
| — <i>Chorlton Union</i> , L. R. 8 Q. B. 5 ; 42 L. J. M. C. 34 | 528 |
| — <i>Christchurch</i> , 12 Q. B. 149 | 307 |
| — <i>Cinque Ports</i> , 17 Q. B. D. 191 ; 55 L. J. M. C. 156 ; 34 W. R. 789 | 288 |
| — <i>City of London Court</i> , 14 Q. B. D. 905 ; 54 L. J. Q. B. 330 ; 52 L. T. 537 ; 33 W. R. 700 ; 49 J. P. 407 | 571 |
| —, [1892] 1 Q. B. 273 ; 61 L. J. Q. B. 337 ; 66 L. T. 135 ; 40 W. R. 215 ; 7 Asp. M. C. 140 | 4, 186 |
| — <i>Clark</i> , 2 Cowp. 610 | 273, 275, 276 |
| — <i>Clear</i> , 4 B. & C. 899 ; 7 D. & R. 393 | 575 |
| — <i>Cleworth</i> , 4 B. & S. 927 ; 9 L. T. 682 ; 33 L. J. M. C. 79 ; 10 Jur. N. S. 360 ; 12 W. R. 375 | 469 |
| — <i>Clifton</i> , 2 East 168 | 416 |
| — <i>Coaks</i> , 3 E. & B. 249 ; 23 L. J. Q. B. 133 ; 2 C. L. R. 947 ; 18 Jur. 378 | 115 |
| — <i>Cohen</i> , 8 Cox C. C. 41 ; 18 L. T. 489 ; 16 W. R. 941 | 141 |
| — <i>Coke</i> , 1 East P. C. 400 | 372 |
| — <i>Collingwood</i> , 12 Q. B. 681 ; 3 New Sess. Cas. 252 ; 17 L. J. M. C. 138 ; 12 Jur. 750'. | 96 |
| — <i>Consistory Court</i> , 2 B. & S. 339 ; 31 L. J. Q. B. 106 ; 5 L. T. 795 ; 8 Jur. N. S. 1131 ; 10 W. R. 343 | 406 |

TABLE OF CASES.

XCV

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| R. v. Cook, 13 Q. B. D. 377; 51 L. T. 21; 32 W. R. 796; 48 J. P. 694 | 394 |
| — Cooke, 2 East P. C. 616 | 459 |
| — Corfe Mullen, 1 B. & A. 211 | 532, 534 |
| — Cornforth, 2 Stra. 1162 | 82, 386 |
| — Cottle, 16 Q. B. 412; 20 L. J. M. C. 162; 15 Jur. 721 | 382 |
| — Cotton, 1 E. & E. 203; 28 L. J. M. C. 22; 5 Jur. N. S. 311; 7 W. R. 62 | 184 |
| — Cousins, 4 B. & S. 849; 33 L. J. M. C. 87 | 416 |
| — Cowper, 24 Q. B. D. 533; 59 L. J. Q. B. 228; 62 L. T. 583; 38 W. R. 408 | 54, 105 |
| — Cox, 2 Burr. 785 | 356 |
| — Crawshaw, 30 L. J. M. C. 58; 3 L. T. 51; 9 W. R. 68; Bell C. C. 303; 8 Cox C. C. 375 | 574 |
| — Cridland, 7 E. & B. 853; 27 L. J. M. C. 28; 3 Jur. N. S. 1213 | 137, 139 |
| — Croke, 1 Cowp. 30 | 266, 420 |
| — Crowan, 14 Q. B. 221; 3 New Sess. Cas. 663; 19 L. J. M. C. 20; 13 Jur. 1099 | 317 |
| — Cabitt, 22 Q. B. D. 622; 58 L. J. M. C. 132; 60 L. T. 638; 37 W. R. 492; 53 J. P. 470; 16 Cox C. C. 618 | 568 |
| — Cumberland, 3 B. & P. 354 | 190 |
| —, 4 A. & E. 695 | 346 |
| — Cumberworth, 4 A. & E. 731; 1 N. & P. 197; 2 H. & W. 439 | 420 |
| — Cunningham, 5 East 478 | 460 |
| — Cutbush, 4 Burr. 2204 | 418 |
| —, L. R. 2 Q. B. 379; 36 L. J. M. C. 70; 16 L. T. 282; 15 W. R. 742; 13 Cox C. C. 489; 8 B. & S. 319 | 430 |
| — Damarell, L. R. 3 Q. B. 50; 37 L. J. M. C. 21; 8 B. & S. 659 | 16 |
| — Darlington School, 6 Q. B. 682 | 418, 514 |
| — Davie, 6 A. & E. 374 | 424 |
| — Davis, L. R. 1 C. C. R. 272 | 22, 384 |
| —, 1 Bail. C. C. 191; 22 L. J. M. C. 143 | 16 |
| —, 1 Leach 271 | 258 |
| —, 5 B. & A. 551 | 368 |
| —, Say. 133 | 568, 573 |
| — Dean, 12 M. & W. 42; 13 L. J. Ex. 33 | 275, 277 |
| — De Mattos, 7 C. & P. 458 | 202 |
| — Denbighshire, 4 East 142 | 532 |
| — Denton, 18 Q. B. 761; 21 L. J. M. C. 207; 17 Jur. 453 | 586 |
| — Depardo, 1 Taunt. 26; R. & R. C. C. 134 | 202 |
| — De Portugal, 16 Q. B. D. 487; 55 L. J. Q. B. 567; 34 W. R. 42; 50 J. P. 501 | 471 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| R. v. Derby, Skin. 370 | 335 |
| — Derbyshire, 7 Q. B. 193 | 9 |
| — —, 2 Keny. 299 | 180 |
| — Devon, 8 B. & C. 640 | 268 |
| — Dickenson, 7 E. & B. 831; 26 L. J. M. C. 204; 3 Jur. N. S. 1076 | 472 |
| — Dixon, 3 M. & S. 11; 4 Camp. 12 | 142, 145 |
| — Dorsetshire, 15 East 200, 594; 13 R. R. 443 | 268 |
| — Doubleday, 3 E. & E. 501 | 477 |
| — Dove, 3 B. & Ald. 596 | 217 |
| — Dowling, 8 E. & B. 605; 27 L. J. Q. B. 28 | 329 |
| — Downes, 3 T. R. 560 | 231 |
| — D'Oyly, 12 A. & E. 139; 4 Jur. 1056; 4 P. & D. 52 | 117 |
| — Dunne, 2 M. & S. 201 | 78 |
| — Dursley, 5 A. & E. 10; H. & W. 9; 6 N. & M. 333 | 284 |
| — Dyott, 6 Q. B. D. 47; 51 L. J. M. C. 104; 30 W. R. 799; 47 J. P. 54 | 20 |
| — Dyson, [1894] 2 Q. B. 176; 63 L. J. M. C. 124; 58 J. P. 528; 70 L. T. 877; 42 W. R. 526; 1 Manson 283 | 149 |
| — Eastbourne, 4 East 103 | 210 |
| — Eastern Counties Ry. Co., 5 E. & B. 974; 25 L. J. M. C. 49; 2 Jur. N. S. 161 | 266 |
| — Eaton, 2 T. R. 472; 1 R. R. 436 | 165 |
| — Edmundson, 2 E. & E. 77; 8 Cox C. C. 212; 28 L. J. M. C. 213; 5 Jur. N. S. 1351 | 479 |
| — Edwards, 9 B. & C. 652 | 78 |
| — —, 13 Q. B. D. 586; 53 L. J. M. C. 149; 51 L. T. 586 | 312 |
| — Ellis, 6 Q. B. 501 | 19 |
| — Elmsley, 2 Lew. 126 | 371 |
| — Ely, 15 Q. B. 827; 4 New Sess. Cas. 222; 19 L. J. M. C. 223; 14 Jur. 956 | 508 |
| — Essex, 1 B. & A. 210 | 268 |
| — —, 34 L. J. M. C. 41; 11 L. T. 486; 13 W. R. 186 | 269 |
| — —, 4 T. R. 591; 2 R. R. 470 | 427, 502 |
| — Essex C. C. Judge, 18 Q. B. D. 704; 56 L. J. Q. B. 315; 57 L. T. 643; 35 W. R. 511; 51 J. P. 549 | 570, 571 |
| — Everdon, 9 East 101 | 331 |
| — Everett, 1 E. & B. 273 | 229 |
| — Eye, 4 B. & Ald. 271; 2 D. & R. 172; 1 B. & C. 85 | 345 |
| — Eyre, L. R. 3 Q. B. 487; 37 L. J. M. C. 159; 18 L. T. 511; 16 W. R. 754; 9 B. & S. 329 | 484 |
| — Farewell, 2 Stra. 1209 | 190 |
| — Farmor, [1892] 1 Q. B. 637; 61 L. J. M. C. 65; 65 L. T. 736; 40 W. R. 228; 56 J. P. 341; 17 Cox C. C. 413 | 197 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xcvii

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| <i>R. v. Farrow</i> , D. & B. C. C. 164; 3 Jur. N. S. 167 | 389 |
| — <i>Faversham Fishery Co.</i> , 8 T. R. 352; 4 R. R. 691 | 567 |
| — <i>Fawcett</i> , 11 Cox C. C. 305 | 335, 349 |
| — <i>Fell</i> , 1 B. & A. 380 | 182 |
| — <i>Ferrall</i> , 2 Den. C. C. 51; T. & M. 390; 20 L. J. M. C. 39; 15 Jur. 42 | 563 |
| — <i>Finnis</i> , 28 L. J. M. C. 201; 1 E. & E. 935; 5 Jur. N. S. 791 266, 348 | |
| — <i>Fitchie</i> , 1 D. & B. C. C. 175; 7 Cox C. C. 257; 26 L. J. M. C. 90; 3 Jur. N. S. 413 | 397 |
| — <i>Fletcher</i> , L. R. 1 C. C. 320; 40 L. J. M. C. 123; 24 L. T. 742; 19 W. R. 781; 12 Cox C. C. 77 | 547 |
| — <i>Fordham</i> , 11 A. & E. 73; 3 P. & D. 95 | 535 |
| — <i>Forrest</i> , 3 T. R. 38; 1 R. R. 628 | 517 |
| — <i>Foulkes</i> , L. R. 2 C. C. R. 150; 44 L. J. M. C. 65; 32 L. T. 407; 23 W. R. 696. | 392 |
| — <i>Francis</i> , 2 Stra. 1015 | 371 |
| — <i>Fretwell</i> , L. & C. 161; 31 L. J. M. C. 145; 9 Cox C. C. 152; 8 Jur. N. S. 466; 6 L. T. 333; 10 W. R. 545 | 389 |
| — <i>Frost</i> , 9 C. & P. 129 | 453 |
| — <i>Fylingdales</i> , 7 B. & C. 438 | 113 |
| — <i>Gale</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 141; 46 L. J. M. C. 134; 35 L. T. 526; 13 Cox C. C. 340 | 390 |
| — <i>Ganz</i> , 9 Q. B. D. 93; 51 L. J. Q. B. 419; 46 L. T. 592 | 194 |
| — <i>Gardner</i> , Cowp. 79 | 85 |
| — <i>Garrett</i> , Dears. C. C. 233; 6 Cox C. C. 260; 2 C. L. R. 106; 23 L. J. M. C. 20; 17 Jur. 1060 | 376 |
| — <i>Giles</i> , 8 Pri. 293 | 489 |
| — <i>Gillyard</i> , 12 Q. B. 527; 17 L. J. M. C. 153; 12 Jur. 655 | 180 |
| — <i>Glamorganshire</i> , 1 L. M. & P. 336; 19 L. J. M. C. 172; 15 Jur. 679 | 175 |
| — <i>Glover</i> , R. & R. 269 | 391 |
| — <i>Gompertz</i> , 9 Q. B. 824; 16 L. J. Q. B. 121; 11 Jur. 204 | 155 |
| — <i>Gordon</i> , 23 Q. B. D. 354; 58 L. J. M. C. 117; 60 L. T. 872; 53 J. P. 807; 16 Cox C. C. 622 | 391 |
| — <i>Gould</i> , 1 Salk. 381 | 573 |
| — <i>Gravesend</i> , 3 B. & A. 240 | 555 |
| — <i>Great Bolton</i> , 8 B. & C. 74 | 449, 452 |
| — <i>Great Farringdon</i> , 9 B. & C. 541 | 110 |
| — <i>Great Marlow</i> , 2 East 244; 6 R. R. 420 | 517 |
| — <i>Great Salkeld</i> , 6 M. & S. 408 | 165 |
| — <i>Green</i> , 2 L. M. & P. 130; 20 L. J. M. C. 168; 15 Jur. 128 | 567 |
| — <i>Greene</i> , 6 A. & E. 548; 1 N. & P. 631; W. W. & D. 291 | 440 |

| | PAGE |
|---|--------|
| <i>R. v. Greene</i> , 17 Q. B. 793 ; 21 L. J. M. C. 137 ; 16 Jur. 663 . | 501 |
| — <i>Greenland</i> , L. R. 1 C. C. 95 ; 11 Cox C. C. 193 ; 38 L. J. M. C. 8 ; 19 L. T. 364 ; 17 W. R. 179 . | 238 |
| — <i>Gregory</i> , 5 B. & A. 555 ; 2 N. & M. 478 . | 574 |
| — <i>Griffiths</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 145 ; 60 L. J. M. C. 93 ; 39 W. R. 719 | 301 |
| — <i>Grimwade</i> , 1 Cox C. C. 85 ; 1 Den. 330 ; 1 C. & K. 592 . | 388 |
| — <i>Gwenop</i> , 3 T. R. 133 . | 60, 71 |
| — <i>Hadfield</i> , L. R. 1 C. C. 253 ; 39 L. J. M. C. 131 ; 22 L. T. 664 ; 18 W. R. 955 ; 11 Cox C. C. 574 . | 388 |
| — <i>Haigh</i> , 3 T. R. 637 . | 569 |
| — <i>Haines</i> , R. & R. 451 . | 387 |
| — <i>Hale</i> , 3 C. & P. 409 . | 137 |
| — <i>Halifax</i> , 2 B. & A. 211 . | 164 |
| — <i>Hall</i> , 1 B. & C. 123 . | 74 |
| — —, [1891] 1 Q. B. 747 ; 60 L. J. M. C. 124 ; 64 L. T. 394 ; 17 Cox C. C. 278 . | 571 |
| — <i>Hammond</i> , 17 Q. B. 772 ; 21 L. J. Q. B. 153 . | 91 |
| — <i>Hampden</i> , 3 State Trials 1235 . | 364 |
| — <i>Hamstall Redware</i> , 3 T. R. 380 . | 517 |
| — <i>Hanson</i> , 4 B. & A. 519 . | 231 |
| — <i>Hants</i> , JJ. of, 1 B. & A. 654 . | 81 |
| — <i>Harden</i> , 2 E. & B. 188 ; 22 L. J. Q. B. 299 ; 17 Jur. 804 . | 220 |
| — <i>Hardy</i> , L. R. 1 C. C. 278 ; 40 L. J. M. C. 62 ; 23 L. T. 785 ; 19 W. R. 359 ; 11 Cox C. C. 656 . | 388 |
| — <i>Harper</i> , 7 Q. B. D. 78 ; 50 L. J. M. C. 90 ; 44 L. T. 615 ; 29 W. R. 743 ; 14 Cox C. C. 574 . | 375 |
| — <i>Harrauld</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 361 ; 41 L. J. Q. B. 173 ; 26 L. T. 616 ; 20 W. R. 328 . | 117 |
| — <i>Harris</i> , 7 C. & P. 429 . | 371 |
| — —, Car. & M. 661 . | 396 |
| — —, 7 C. & P. 446 . | 467 |
| — —, 4 T. R. 202 ; 2 R. R. 358 . | 569 |
| — <i>Harrogate</i> , 15 Q. B. 1012 ; 15 Jur. 422 ; 4 New Sess. Ca. 319 ; 20 L. J. M. C. 25 . | 188 |
| — <i>Harvey</i> , 1 Wils. 164 . | 369 |
| — <i>Hastings</i> , 5 B. & A. 692 n. ; 1 D. & R. 148 . | 336 |
| — <i>Haughton</i> , 1 E. & B. 501 ; 22 L. J. M. C. 89 ; 17 Jur. 455 . | 440 |
| — <i>Havering Atte Bower</i> , 5 B. & A. 691 ; 2 D. & R. 176 . | 336 |
| — <i>Hawkesworth</i> , 1 T. R. 450 ; 2 East P. C. 255 . | 155 |
| — <i>Hazelton</i> , L. R. 2 C. C. 134 ; 44 L. J. M. C. 11 ; 31 L. T. 451 ; 23 W. R. 139 . | 391 |
| — <i>Hellier</i> , 17 Q. B. 229 ; 21 L. J. M. C. 3 ; 15 Jur. 901 . | 241 |
| — <i>Helton</i> , Burr. S. C. 187 ; 2 Stra. 1168 . | 82 |

TABLE OF CASES.

xcix

| | PAGE |
|--|--------------------|
| <i>R. v. Henley</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 504 ; 61 L. J. M. C. 135 ; 66 L. T. 675 ; 40 W. R. 383 ; 56 J. P. 391 | 115 |
| — <i>Hennah</i> , 13 Cox C. C. 547 | 376 |
| — <i>Herford</i> , 3 E. & E. 115 ; 29 L. J. Q. B. 249 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 750 ; 8 W. R. 579 | 424 |
| — <i>Hermann</i> , 4 Q. B. D. 284 ; 48 L. J. M. C. 106 ; 40 L. T. 263 ; 27 W. R. 475 | 386 |
| — <i>Hertford College</i> , 3 Q. B. D. 693 ; 47 L. J. Q. B. 649 ; 39 L. T. 18 ; 27 W. R. 347 | 38 |
| — <i>Heywood</i> , 1 M. & S. 624 | 470 |
| — <i>Hicklin</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 360 ; 37 L. J. M. C. 89 ; 16 W. R. 801 ; 11 Cox C. C. 19 ; 18 L. T. 395 | 149 |
| — <i>Hicks</i> , 4 E. & B. 633 ; 24 L. J. M. C. 94 ; 1 Jur. N. S. 654 | 577 |
| — <i>Higginson</i> , 2 B. & S. 471 ; 31 L. J. M. C. 189 | 266 |
| — <i>Higham</i> , 7 E. & B. 557 ; 26 L. J. M. C. 116 | 16 |
| — <i>Hillman</i> , L. & C. 343 ; 9 Cox C. C. 386 ; 33 L. J. M. C. 60 ; 9 L. T. 518 ; 12 W. R. 111 | 389 |
| — <i>Hipswell</i> , 8 B. & C. 466 ; 2 M. & R. 474 | 297, 555 |
| — <i>Hodges</i> , 1 Moo. & M. 341 | 471 |
| — <i>Hodnett</i> , 1 T. R. 96 | 4, 5, 82, 369, 386 |
| — <i>Hogg</i> , 1 T. R. 721 ; 1 R. R. 375 | 425, 431 |
| — <i>Holl</i> , 7 Q. B. D. 575 ; 50 L. J. Q. B. 763 ; 45 L. T. 69 ; 46 J. P. 53 | 326 |
| — <i>Hopkins</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 621 ; 62 L. J. M. C. 57 ; 68 L. T. 292 ; 41 W. R. 431 ; 57 J. P. 152 | 257 |
| — <i>Hoseason</i> , 14 East 605 | 259 |
| — <i>How</i> , 33 L. J. M. C. 53 ; 9 L. T. 385 | 116, 117 |
| — <i>Howell</i> , 9 C. & P. 437 | 395 |
| — <i>Hube</i> , 5 T. R. 542 ; 1 Peake 181 ; 2 R. R. 669 | 274 |
| — <i>Hughes</i> , <i>Dears. & B.</i> 188 ; 26 L. J. M. C. 133 | 165 |
| — —, 3 A. & E. 425 | 513 |
| — —, 4 Q. B. D. 614 ; 48 L. J. M. C. 151 ; 40 L. T. 685 | 547, 550 |
| — <i>Hull, Governors and Guardians of Kingston upon</i> , 2 E. & B. 182 ; 22 L. J. Q. B. 324 ; 17 Jur. 914 | 497 |
| — <i>Hull Dock Co.</i> , 3 B. & C. 516 ; 5 D. & R. 359 | 411 |
| — <i>Hull and Selby Ry. Co.</i> , 6 Q. B. 70 ; 3 Rail. Cas. 705 ; 13 L. J. Q. B. 257 ; 8 Jur. 491 | 572 |
| — <i>Hulme</i> , L. R. 5 Q. B. 377 ; 39 L. J. Q. B. 149 ; 22 L. T. 673 ; 18 W. R. 830 | 326, 458 |
| — <i>Huntingdonshire</i> , 1 L. M. & P. 78 ; 19 L. J. M. C. 127 ; 4 New Sess. Cas. 101 | 9, 102 |
| — <i>Huntley</i> , 3 El. & Bl. 172 ; 23 L. J. M. C. 106 ; 18 Jur. 745 | 241 |
| — <i>Hyde</i> , 7 E. & B. 859 ; 21 L. J. M. C. 94 ; 16 Jur. 337 | 180 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| <i>R. v. Idle</i> , 2 B. & Ald. 149 | 241 |
| — <i>Ingall</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 199; 46 L. J. M. C. 113; 35 L. T. 552; 25 W. R. 57 | 520, 528, 529 |
| — <i>Ingham</i> , 5 B. & S. 257; 9 Cox C. C. 508; 33 L. J. Q. B. 183; 10 Jur. N. S. 968; 10 L. T. 456; 12 W. R. 793 | 456 |
| — <i>Ingram</i> , 2 Salk. 593 | 529 |
| — <i>Inland Revenue Commrs.</i> , 21 Q. B. D. 569; 57 L. J. M. C. 92; 59 L. T. 378; 36 W. R. 696; 52 J. P. 390 | 227 |
| — <i>Ipsstones</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 216; 37 L. J. M. C. 37; 17 L. T. 497; 16 W. R. 538; 9 B. & S. 106 | 80 |
| — <i>Ipswich Union</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 269; 46 L. J. M. C. 207; 36 L. T. 317; 25 W. R. 511 | 298, 302 |
| — <i>James</i> , 1 East 303 n. | 190 |
| — <i>Jay</i> , 8 E. & B. 469; 27 L. J. M. C. 25; 4 Jur. N. S. 407 . . | 188 |
| — <i>Jeans</i> , 1 C. & K. 539 | 371 |
| — <i>Jenkins</i> , 3 B. & S. 116; 32 L. J. M. C. 1; 9 Jur. N. S. 570; 7 L. T. 272; 11 W. R. 20 | 512 |
| — <i>Jepson</i> , 2 East P. C. 1115 | 388 |
| — <i>Johnson</i> , 6 Cl. & F. 41 | 249 |
| — <i>—</i> , 1 Stra. 261 | 547 |
| — <i>Jones</i> , 12 A. & E. 684 | 368 |
| — <i>—</i> , 5 Cox 226 | 388 |
| — <i>Jordan</i> , 7 C. & P. 432 | 387 |
| — <i>Kensington</i> , 12 Q. B. 654; 17 L. J. Q. B. 332; 2 Jur. 747 . | 174 |
| — <i>Kent (Inhabitants)</i> , 13 East 220; 12 R. R. 330 | 508 |
| — <i>Kent, JJ. L. R.</i> 8 Q. B. 305; 21 W. R. 635; 42 L. J. M. C. 112 | 102 |
| — <i>—</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 181; 59 L. J. M. C. 51; 62 L. T. 114; 38 W. R. 253; 54 J. P. 453; 17 Cox C. C. 61 | 281 |
| — <i>Kerrison</i> , 1 M. & S. 435; 14 R. R. 491 | 508 |
| — <i>Keyn</i> , 2 Ex. D. 63; 13 Cox C. C. 403; 46 L. J. M. C. 17 201, 202, 437 | |
| — <i>King</i> , 1 Salk. 182 | 275 |
| — <i>—</i> , 1 Sess. Cas. 88 | 391 |
| — <i>Kingston-upon-Thames JJ.</i> , E. B. & E. 256; 27 L. J. M. C. 199; 4 Jur. N. S. 758 | 266 |
| — <i>Kipps</i> , 4 Cox C. C. 167 | 387 |
| — <i>Knapp</i> , 22 L. J. M. C. 139; 2 E. & B. 447; 17 Jur. 530; 1 C. L. R. 443 | 227 |
| — <i>Lambe</i> , 5 T. R. 76 | 280 |
| — <i>Lancashire</i> , 8 E. & B. 563; 4 Jur. N. S. 375; 27 L. J. M. C. 161 | 525 |
| — <i>Land Tax Com.</i> , 2 E. & B. 694; 22 L. J. Q. B. 386; 18 Jur. 285 | 277 |

TABLE OF CASES.

ci

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| R. v. Langford, Car. & M. 602; 2 Moo. C. C. 252 . . . | 137, 396 |
| — Langrville, 14 Q. B. D. 83; 54 L. J. Q. B. 124; 52 L. T. 253; 33 W. R. 213 . . . | 35 |
| — Lawrence, 4 C. & P. 231 . . . | 387 |
| — Leeds Ry. Co., 18 Q. B. 343 . . . | 312 |
| — Leicester, 7 B. & C. 6; 9 D. & R. 772 . . . | 531 |
| — Leicestershire, 15 Q. B. 88; 4 New Sess. Cas. 124; 19 L. J. M. C. 209; 14 Jur. 550 . . . | 541 |
| — Lesley, 1 Bell 220; 29 L. J. M. C. 97; 8 Cox C. C. 269; 6 Jur. N. S. 202; 8 W. R. 220; 1 L. T. 452 . . . | 201 |
| — Leverson, L. R. 4 Q. B. 394; 18 W. R. 251 . . . | 39, 429 |
| — Lewes Prison, L. R. 10 Q. B. 576; 44 L. J. M. C. 176; 32 L. T. 673; 24 W. R. 13 . . . | 591 |
| — Lewis, D. & B. 182; 26 L. J. M. C. 104 . . . | 202, 446 |
| — Lichfield, 2 Q. B. 693; 2 G. & D. 10; 6 Jur. 624 . . . | 463 |
| — Lightfoot, 6 E. & B. 822; 25 L. J. M. C. 115; 2 Jur. N. S. 786; 4 W. R. 655 . . . | 197 |
| — Lindsay, 14 East 317; 12 R. R. 529 . . . | 508 |
| — Linford, 7 E. & B. 950 . . . | 266 |
| — Little Coggeshall, 6 M. & S. 264 . . . | 166 |
| — Liverpool JJ., 11 Q. B. D. 638; 52 L. J. M. C. 114; 49 L. T. 244; 32 W. R. 20; 47 J. P. 596 . . . | 12 |
| — Llangian, 4 B. & S. 249; 32 L. J. M. C. 225; 8 L. T. 422; 11 W. R. 776 . . . | 220, 451 |
| — Lloyd, 2 East P. C. 1122 . . . | 388 |
| — —, 19 Q. B. D. 213; 56 L. J. M. C. 119; 56 L. T. 750; 35 W. R. 653; 52 J. P. 86; 16 Cox C. C. 235 . . . | 429 |
| — Local Govt. Bd., 10 Q. B. D. 321; 52 L. J. M. C. 4; 48 L. T. 173; 31 W. R. 72; 47 J. P. 228 . . . | 72 |
| — Lofthouse, L. R. 1 Q. B. 433; 35 L. J. Q. B. 145; 12 Jur. N. S. 619; 14 L. T. 359; 14 W. R. 649; 7 B. & S. 747 . . . | 529 |
| — London, 3 Burr. 1456 . . . | 586 |
| — London (Bp.), 24 Q. B. D. 243; 59 L. J. Q. B. 169; 62 L. T. 167; 38 W. R. 214; 54 J. P. 340 . . . | 349, 350 |
| — London C. C., [1892] 1 Q. B. 190; 61 L. J. M. C. 75; 66 L. T. 168; 40 W. R. 285; 56 J. P. 8 . . . | 114 |
| — London JJ., 25 Q. B. D. 357; 59 L. J. M. C. 146; 63 L. T. 253; 39 W. R. 11 . . . | 265 |
| — London JJ. & C. C., [1893] 2 Q. B. 476; 69 L. T. 682 . . . | 280, 540, 542 |
| — Long, 1 Q. B. 740; 1 G. & D. 367; 6 Jur. 98 . . . | 547 |
| — Loom, 1 Moo. C. C. 160 . . . | 459 |
| — Lopes, 1 D. & B. 525; 27 L. J. M. C. 48; 4 Jur. N. S. 98; 7 Cox C. C. 431 . . . | 201 |

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------|
| R. v. Loveless, 1 M. & Rob. 349; 6 C. & P. 596 | 65 |
| — Loxdale, 1 Burr. 445 | 46, 416 |
| — Luffe, 8 East 193 | 96 |
| — Lundie, 31 L. J. M. C. 157; 8 Jur. N. S. 640; 5 L. T. 830; 10 W. R. 267 | 567 |
| — Mabe, 3 A. & E. 531 | 6, 12 |
| — McCann, L. R. 3 Q. B. 677; 37 L. J. M. C. 123; 19 L. T. 115; 16 W. R. 985 | 189 |
| — McKenzie, R. & R. 429 | 586 |
| — Maidenhead, 9 Q. B. D. 494; 51 L. J. Q. B. 444; 46 J. P. 724 | 284 |
| — Mainwaring, E. B. & E. 474; 27 L. J. M. C. 278; 4 Jur. N. S. 928 | 9 |
| — Mallinson, 2 Burr. 679 | 466 |
| — Manchester, 7 E. & B. 453; 26 L. J. M. C. 65 | 71, 152 |
| — —, 4 B. & Ald. 504 | 77 |
| — —, 3 E. & B. 336; 2 C. L. R. 974; 23 L. J. M. C. 48; 18 Jur. 267 | 188 |
| — Manchester Waterworks, 1 B. & C. 630; 3 D. & R. 20 | 474 |
| — Manktelow, Dears. C. C. 159; 6 Cox C. C. 143; 22 L. J. M. C. 115; 17 Jur. 352 | 387 |
| — Mann, 2 Stra. 754 | 191 |
| — Mansel Jones, 23 Q. B. D. 29; 60 L. T. 860; 37 W. R. 508; 53 J. P. 739 | 106 |
| — Margram, 5 T. R. 153 | 10 |
| — Marks, 3 East 157; 6 R. R. 577 | 65 |
| — Marriot, 4 Mod. 144 | 570 |
| — Marsh, 2 B. & C. 717 | 145 |
| — Martin, R. & R. 324 | 374 |
| — Mashiter, 6 A. & E. 153; 1 N. & P. 314; W. W. & D. 173 88, 94, 424 | 88, 94, 424 |
| — Masterton, 6 A. & E. 153; 1 N. & P. 314 | 164 |
| — Mattersey, 4 B. & A. 211; 1 N. & M. 49 | 275 |
| — Matthews, 10 Mod. 26 | 275 |
| — Maude, 2 Dowl. N. S. 58; 11 L. J. M. C. 120; 6 Jur. 646 82, 386 | 82, 386 |
| — Maulden, 8 B. & C. 78 | 284 |
| — Mawgan, 8 A. & E. 496; 3 N. & P. 502 | 586 |
| — Mayor of London, 13 Q. B. 1; 19 L. J. Q. B. 185; 11 Jur. 867 | 251 |
| — Medway Union, L. R. 3 Q. B. 383; 37 L. J. M. C. 100; 18 L. T. 431; 16 W. R. 979; 9 B. & S. 439 | 242 |
| — Mellingham, 2 Bott. 492 | 10 |

TABLE OF CASES.

ciii

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| R. v. Merioneth, 6 Q. B. 163; 13 L. J. M. C. 114 | 175 |
| — Merionethshire, 6 Q. B. 343 | 590 |
| — Metrop. Board of Works, L. R. 4 Q. B. 358; 38 L. J. Q. B. 201; 17 W. R. 1094 | 131 |
| — —, 3 B. & S. 711; 32 L. J. Q. B. 105 | 131 |
| — Metrop. Com. Sewers, 1 E. & B. 694; 22 L. J. Q. B. 234; 17 Jur. 787 | 184 |
| — Metrop. Dist. Ry., L. R. 6 Q. B. 698; 40 L. J. M. C. 113 | 24 |
| — Meyer, 1 Q. B. D. 173; 34 L. T. 247; <i>sub nom</i> R. v. Harrison, 24 W. R. 392 | 114 |
| — Middlesex, 1 L. M. & P. 621; 4 New Sess. Cas. 302; 20 L. J. M. C. 42 | 102 |
| — —, 2 B. & A. 818 | 225 |
| — —, 3 B. & A. 938 | 268 |
| — —, 6 M. & S. 279 | 269 |
| — Midland Ry. Co., 4 E. & B. 958; 1 Jur. N. S. 797 | 460, 474 |
| — —, L. R. 10 Q. B. 389; 44 L. J. Q. B. 137; 32 L. T. 753; 23 W. R. 921 | 474 |
| — Mildenhall, 3 B. & A. 374 | 89 |
| — Mill, 10 C. B. 379; 1 L. M. & P. 695; 20 L. J. C. P. 16; 15 Jur. 59 | 289, 305 |
| — Milledge, 4 Q. B. D. 332; 40 L. T. 748; 27 W. R. 659; 48 L. J. M. C. 139 | 115 |
| — Millis, 10 Cl. & F. 749; 8 Jur. 717 | 3 |
| — Mills, 2 B. & A. 578 | 517 |
| — Milverton, 5 A. & E. 841; 1 N. & P. 179; 2 H. & W. 435 | 59 |
| — Mitchell, 10 East 518 | 90 |
| — Moah, Dears. & P. 626; 7 Cox C. C. 60; 25 L. J. M. C. 66; 2 Jur. N. S. 213 | 51 |
| — Monck, 2 Q. B. D. 544; 46 L. J. M. C. 251; 36 L. T. 720 | 277 |
| — Moore, 3 C. & K. 319; 16 Jur. 750 | 136 |
| — Moreley, 2 Burr. 1011 | 179 |
| — Morgan, 2 Stra. 1066 | 590 |
| — Morris, L. R. 1 C. C. 90; 36 L. J. M. C. 84; 16 L. T. 636; 15 W. R. 990; 10 Cox C. C. 480 | 281 |
| — —, 1 B. & A. 441 | 587 |
| — Morrison, Bell C. C. 158; 8 Cox C. C. 194; 28 L. J. M. C. 201; 33 L. T. O. S. 220; 7 W. R. 554 | 397 |
| — Mortlake, 6 East 397; 2 Smith 530 | 332 |
| — Morton, [1892] 1 Q. B. 39; 61 L. J. Q. B. 39; 65 L. T. 611; 40 W. R. 109; 56 J. P. 105 | 115 |
| — Most, 7 Q. B. D. 244; 50 L. J. M. C. 113; 44 L. T. 823; 29 W. R. 758; 45 J. P. 696; 14 Cox C. C. 583 | 388 |

| | PAGE |
|--|-------------|
| <i>R. v. Mount</i> , L. R. 6 P. C. 283 ; 44 L. J. P. C. 58 ; 32 L. T. 279 ; | |
| 23 W. R. 572 | 199 |
| — <i>Murrow</i> , 1 Moo. C. C. 456 | 467 |
| — <i>Mursley</i> , 1 T. R. 694 | 166 |
| — <i>Myott</i> , 32 L. J. M. C. 138 | 165 |
| — <i>Neath</i> , L. R. 6 Q. B. 707 ; 40 L. J. M. C. 193 | 475 |
| — <i>Nevill</i> , 8 Q. B. 452 | 474 |
| — <i>Newman</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 706 ; 51 L. J. M. C. 87 ; 46 L. T. 394 ; | |
| 30 W. R. 550 ; 46 J. P. 612 | 375 |
| — <i>Nicholson</i> , 12 East 330 | 89 |
| — <i>Norfolk</i> , 4 B. & A. 238 | 335, 346 |
| — —, 5 B. & A. 990 | 415 |
| — <i>North Collingham</i> , 1 B. & C. 578 | 452 |
| — <i>North Curry</i> , 4 B. & C. 953 ; 7 D. & R. 424 | 88 |
| — <i>Northleach</i> , 5 B. & A. 978 | 225, 227 |
| — <i>Norwich</i> , 1 B. & A. 310 | 532 |
| — <i>O'Connor</i> , 15 Cox C. C. 3 ; 45 L. T. 512 ; 46 J. P. 214 | 472 |
| — <i>Oldham</i> , 21 L. J. M. C. 134 ; 2 Den. 473 | 58 |
| — —, Mayor and Corporation of, L. R. 3 Q. B. 474 ; 37 L. J. | |
| M. C. 169 ; 18 L. T. 240 ; 16 W. R. 789 ; 9 B. & S. 202 | 441 |
| — —, Overseers, 10 Q. B. 700 ; 16 L. J. M. C. 110 ; 11 Jur. 487 | 501 |
| — <i>Overton</i> , 1 Dears. 308 ; 23 L. J. M. C. 29 | 155 |
| — <i>Owen</i> , 15 Q. B. 476 ; 19 L. J. Q. B. 490 ; 14 Jur. 953 | 76 |
| — <i>Owens</i> , 2 E. & E. 86 ; 28 L. J. Q. B. 316 | 115 |
| — —, 1 Moo. C. C. 205 | 372 |
| — <i>Oxford</i> (Bp. of), 4 Q. B. D. 525 ; 48 L. J. Q. B. 609 ; 41 | |
| L. T. 122 | 335, 340 |
| — <i>Oxford, V. C. of</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 471 ; 26 L. T. 506 | 54, 90 |
| — <i>Oxfordshire</i> , 1 M. & S. 446 | 525 |
| — <i>Oxley</i> , 6 Q. B. 256 | 567 |
| — <i>Paget</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 151 ; 51 L. J. M. C. 9 ; 45 L. T. 794 ; 30 | |
| W. R. 336 | 78 |
| — <i>Papworth</i> , 2 East 413 | 80 |
| — <i>Parker</i> , 7 C. & P. 829 ; 2 Moo. C. C. 1 | 391 |
| — <i>Patteson</i> , 4 B. & A. 9 ; 1 N. & M. 612 | 536 |
| — <i>Paty</i> , 2 W. Bl. 721 | 484 |
| — <i>Pawlett</i> , L. R. 8 Q. B. 491 ; 42 L. J. M. C. 157 ; 29 L. T. 390 | 415 |
| — <i>Payne</i> , L. R. 1 C. C. 27 ; 35 L. J. M. C. 170 ; 12 Jur. N. S. | |
| 476 ; 14 L. T. 416 ; 14 W. R. 661 | 478 |
| — <i>Pease</i> , 4 B. & A. 30 | 3, 503 |
| — <i>Pembridge</i> , 3 Q. B. 901 ; 3 G. & D. 603 ; 7 Jur. 553 ; 12 | |
| L. J. Q. B. 259 | 34, 80, 407 |
| — <i>Perry</i> , 1 Den. 69 ; 1 C. & K. 725 | 396 |

TABLE OF CASES.

CV

| | PAGE |
|---|------------------|
| R. v. Phillips, 2 Moo. C. C. 235 | 137 |
| —, L. R. 1 Q. B. 648; 35 L. J. M. C. 217; 12 Jur. N. S. 920; 14 W. R. 791 | 287, 334 |
| — Pickford, 1 B. & S. 77; 30 L. J. M. C. 133 | 12 |
| — Pierce, 3 M. & S. 62 | 67 |
| — Pilkington, 2 E. & B. 546; 17 Jur. 554 | 96 |
| — Pinder, 24 L. J. Q. B. 148 | 523 |
| — Pinney, 2 B. & C. 322; 3 D. & R. 578 | 242 |
| — Plowright, 2 Mod. 95 | 179 |
| — Ponsonby, 3 Q. B. 14; 1 G. & D. 713; 6 Jur. 642 | 189 |
| — Poole (Mayor of), 19 Q. B. D. 602, 683; 56 L. J. M. C. 131; 57 L. T. 485; 36 W. R. 239; 52 J. P. 84; 16 Cox C. C. 323 | 583 |
| — Pooley, R. & R. 12 | 396 |
| — Poor Law Commissioners, 6 A. & E. 1; 1 N. & P. 371 | 5, 244, 445, 448 |
| — Portsea, 7 Q. B. D. 384; 50 L. J. M. C. 144 | 307 |
| — Poulter, 20 Q. B. D. 132; 57 L. J. Q. B. 138; 58 L. T. 534; 52 J. P. 244; 36 W. R. 117 | 131 |
| — Powell, 21 L. J. M. C. 78; L. R. 2 C. C. R. 403; 16 Jur. 177 | 396 |
| — Poynder, 1 B. & C. 178; 2 D. & R. 258 | 92 |
| — Pratt, 4 E. & B. 860; Dears. C. C. 502; 3 C. L. R. 686; 24 L. J. M. C. 113; 1 Jur. N. S. 681 | 390, 437, 451 |
| — Preston, 7 Dowl. 593 | 80 |
| — Price, 5 C. & P. 510 | 395 |
| —, 8 Moo. P. C. C. 203 | 487 |
| —, 11 A. & E. 727; 3 P. & D. 421; 4 Jur. 291 | 568, 569 |
| — Prince, L. R. 2 C. C. R. 154; 44 L. J. M. C. 122; 32 L. T. 700; 24 W. R. 76; 13 Cox C. C. 138 | 138, 139, 145 |
| —, 2 C. & P. 517 | 471 |
| — Pugh, 1 Dougl. 188 | 243, 249 |
| — Purdey, 5 B. & S. 909; 34 L. J. M. C. 4; 11 Jur. N. S. 153; 11 L. T. 309; 13 W. R. 75 | 81, 269 |
| — Ratcliffe, 10 Q. B. D. 74; 52 L. J. M. C. 40; 47 L. T. 388; 15 Cox C. C. 127 | 235 |
| — Read, 13 Q. B. 524; 4 New Sess. Cas. 7; 18 L. J. M. C. 164; 13 Jur. 789 | 284 |
| —, 3 Q. B. D. 131; 14 Cox C. C. 17; 47 L. J. M. C. 50; 37 L. T. 722; 26 W. R. 283 | 374 |
| — Reason, Dears. & P. C. C. 226; 2 C. L. R. 120; 6 Cox C. C. 227; 23 L. J. M. C. 11; 17 Jur. 1014 | 392 |
| — Richards, 8 T. R. 634; 5 R. R. 489 | 569 |
| — Robins, 1 C. & K. 456 | 387 |
| — Robinson, 2 Burr. 800 | 257, 568 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| <i>R. v. Robinson</i> , 28 L. J. M. C. 38; Bell C. C. 34; 5 Jur. N. S. 203; 32 L. T. 502; 7 W. R. 203 | 375 |
| —, 17 Q. B. 466 | 567 |
| — <i>Robson</i> , 16 Q. B. D. 137; 55 L. J. M. C. 55; 53 L. T. 823; 34 W. R. 276; 50 J. P. 488; 15 Cox C. C. 772 | 87 |
| — <i>Rochester</i> , 7 E. & B. 910 | 529, 532 |
| — <i>Rose</i> , 2 Cox 329 | 135 |
| —, 5 E. & B. 49; 24 L. J. M. C. 130; 1 Jur. N. S. 803 | 418 |
| — <i>Rowlands</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 530; 51 L. J. M. C. 51; 46 L. T. 286; 30 W. R. 444; 46 J. P. 437; 15 Cox C. C. 31 | 371 |
| — <i>Russell</i> , 13 Q. B. 237; 3 New Sess. Cas. 368; 18 L. J. M. C. 106; 13 Jur. 259 | 217 |
| —, 1 Moo. C. C. 377 | 387 |
| —, 6 East 427; 2 Smith 424; 8 R. R. 506 | 581 |
| — <i>Saddlers' Co.</i> , 10 H. L. 404; 32 L. J. Q. B. 337; 9 Jur. N. S. 1081; 11 W. R. 1004 | 86, 278 |
| — <i>Saffron Walden</i> , 9 Q. B. 76; 9 New Sess. Cas. 360; 15 L. J. M. C. 115; 10 Jur. 639 | 491 |
| — <i>Sainsbury</i> , 4 T. R. 456; Nolan 8 | 114, 568 |
| — <i>St. Albans</i> , 22 L. J. M. C. 142; 17 Jur. 531 | 180 |
| — <i>St. George's, Hanover Square</i> , 3 Camp. 222; 13 R. R. 792 | 236 |
| — <i>St. George's Union</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 90; 41 L. J. M. C. 30; 25 L. T. 696; 20 W. R. 179 | 54 |
| — <i>St. Giles (R. v. Chadwick)</i> , 11 Q. B. 173 | 82 |
| — <i>St. Gregory</i> , 2 A. & E. 99; 4 N. & M. 137 | 292 |
| — <i>St. James, Westminster</i> , 2 A. & E. 241; 4 N. & M. 252 | 185 |
| —, 5 A. & E. 391; 2 H. & W. 253 | 249 |
| — <i>St. Martin's</i> , L. R. 2 Q. B. 493; 36 L. J. M. C. 99; 8 B. & S. 536; 16 L. T. 625; 15 W. R. 1096 | 188 |
| — <i>St. Mary</i> , 3 Nev. & P. 416 | 117 |
| — <i>St. Mary Abbots</i> , [1891] 1 Q. B. 378; 60 L. J. Q. B. 52; 64 L. T. 240; 39 W. R. 278; 55 J. P. 502 | 102 |
| — <i>St. Mary, Islington</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 523; 59 L. J. Q. B. 462; 63 L. T. 226; 39 W. R. 10; 54 J. P. 807 | 429 |
| — <i>St. Mary, Whitechapel</i> , 12 Q. B. 127; 12 Jur. 792; 3 New Sess. Cas. 262; 17 L. J. M. C. 172; 12 J. P. 593 | 307 |
| — <i>St. Matthew</i> , 32 L. T. 558 | 116 |
| — <i>St. Nicholas</i> , 2 Stra. 1066 | 292 |
| — <i>St. Pancras</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 275; 59 L. J. Q. B. 245; 38 W. R. 311; 54 J. P. 389 | 173, 349 |
| — <i>St. Paul's</i> , 10 B. & C. 12 | 10 |
| — <i>St. Peter's</i> , 1 B. & Ad. 916 | 10 |
| — <i>St. Sepulchre</i> , 1 B. & Ad. 934 | 164 |

TABLE OF CASES.

cvii

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------|
| <i>R. v. St. Sepulchre</i> , 28 L. J. M. C. 187; 1 E. & E. 813; 5 Jur. N. S. 876; 7 W. R. 447 | 302 |
| — <i>Salisbury</i> , 8 A. & E. 716; 3 N. & P. 476 | 247 |
| — <i>Salop</i> , 8 A. & E. 173 | 487 |
| — —, 6 Q. B. D. 669; 50 L. J. M. C. 72; 29 W. R. 567 | 544 |
| — <i>Saltren</i> , Cald. 444 | 431 |
| — <i>Sanchee</i> , 1 Ld. Raym. 323 | 235 |
| — <i>Sanders</i> , 9 C. & P. 79 | 465 |
| — <i>Sankey</i> , 3 Q. B. D. 379; 47 L. J. Q. B. 96 | 501 |
| — <i>Sattler</i> , 1 D. & B. 525; 27 L. J. M. C. 48; 4 Jur. N. S. 98; 7 Cox C. C. 431 | 201 |
| — <i>Scaife</i> , 17 Q. B. 238; 5 Cox C. C. 243; 2 Den. C. C. 281; 20 L. J. M. C. 229; 15 Jur. 607 | 426 |
| — <i>Scott</i> , 3 T. R. 602 | 424 |
| — —, <i>Dears. & Bell</i> C. C. 47; 25 L. J. M. C. 128; 2 Jur. N. S. 1096 | 495 |
| — <i>Seberg</i> , L. R. 1 C. C. 264; 39 L. J. M. C. 133; 22 L. T. 523; 18 W. R. 935; 11 Cox C. C. 520 | 201 |
| — <i>Sedgley</i> , 2 B. & A. 63 | 460 |
| — <i>Senior</i> , 1 L. & C. C. C. 401; 9 Cox C. C. 469; 33 L. J. M. C. 125; 10 Jur. N. S. 547; 10 L. T. 428; 12 W. R. 749 | 227 |
| — <i>Serva</i> , 1 Den. 104; 2 C. & K. 53 | 203 |
| — <i>Sevenoaks</i> , 7 Q. B. 136; 1 New Sess. Cas. 495; 14 L. J. M. C. 92; 9 Jur. 489 | 268 |
| — <i>Shadbolt</i> , 5 C. & P. 504 | 371 |
| — <i>Shaw</i> , 34 L. J. M. C. 169; L. & C. 579; 10 Cox C. C. 66; 11 Jur. N. S. 415; 12 L. T. 470; 13 W. R. 692 | 547 |
| — <i>Shee</i> , 4 Q. B. 2; 3 G. & D. 80; 12 L. J. M. C. 53, 186; 7 Jur. 810 | 189 |
| — <i>Shepherd</i> , 1 Q. B. 170; 4 P. & D. 534; 5 Jur. 432 | 189 |
| — <i>Shiles</i> , 1 Q. B. 919 | 287, 334 |
| — <i>Shrewsbury</i> , 1 E. & B. 711; 22 L. J. M. C. 98 | 9 |
| — —, 3 B. & A. 216 | 478 |
| — <i>Shurmer</i> , 17 Q. B. D. 323; 55 L. J. M. C. 153; 55 L. T. 126; 34 W. R. 656; 50 J. P. 743 | 40, 544 |
| — <i>Silvester</i> , 33 L. J. M. C. 79; 10 Jur. N. S. 360; 4 B. & S. 927; 9 L. T. 682; 12 W. R. 375 | 469 |
| — <i>Simpson</i> , Car. & M. 669 | 396 |
| — <i>Skeen</i> , Bell C. C. 97; 28 L. J. M. C. 91 | 4, 277, 284 |
| — <i>Slade</i> , 21 Q. B. D. 433; 57 L. J. M. C. 120; 59 L. T. 640; 37 W. R. 141; 52 J. P. 599; 16 Cox C. C. 496 | 97, 375 |
| — <i>Slator</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 267; 51 L. J. Q. B. 246; 30 W. R. 410; 46 J. P. 694 | 19, 456 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| R. v. Sleep, 1 L. & C. 44; 30 L. J. M. C. 170; 8 Cox C. C. 472; 7 Jur. N. S. 979; 4 L. T. 525; 9 W. R. 709 | 141 |
| — Smith, L. R. 10 Q. B. 604 | 16 |
| — —, L. R. 1 C. C. 266; 39 L. J. M. C. 112; 18 W. R. 932 109, 110, 380 | |
| — —, 29 L. J. M. C. 216; 8 W. R. 589 | 269 |
| — —, 4 T. R. 414 | 432 |
| — —, 5 Q. B. 614; D. & M. 564; 13 L. J. Q. B. 166; 8 Jur. 599 | 514 |
| — —, L. R. 1 C. C. 110; 37 L. J. M. C. 6; 17 L. T. 263; 16 W. R. 140; 11 Cox C. C. 10 | 547, 548 |
| — —, 1 L. & C. 131; 9 Cox C. C. 110; 31 L. J. M. C. 105; 8 Jur. N. S. 199; 5 L. T. 761; 10 W. R. 273 | 589 |
| — —, L. R. 8 Q. B. 146; 42 L. J. M. C. 46; 28 L. T. 129; 21 W. R. 382 | 591 |
| — Sneyd, 9 D. P. C. 1001; 5 Jur. 962 | 532 |
| — Somersetshire, 5 B. & C. 816; 6 D. & R. 469 | 180 |
| — Southampton, 21 L. J. M. C. 201; 18 Q. B. 841; 17 Jur. 254 236 | |
| — South Kilvington, 5 Q. B. 216; 3 G. & D. 157; 13 L. J. M. C. 3; 7 Jur. 1108 | 165 |
| — South Wales Ry. Co., 13 Q. B. 988; 18 L. J. Q. B. 310; 13 Jur. 1095; 6 Rly. Cas. 197 | 180 |
| — —, 14 Q. B. 902; 6 Rly. Cas. 489; 19 L. J. Q. B. 272; 14 Jur. 828 | 511 |
| — South Weald, 5 B. & S. 391; 33 L. J. M. C. 193; 10 Jur. N. S. 1099; 10 L. T. 498; 12 W. R. 873 | 346, 454 |
| — Sparrow, 2 Stra. 1123 | 531, 532 |
| — Spratley, 6 E. & B. 363; 25 L. J. Q. B. 257; 2 Jur. N. S. 735 479 | |
| — Spurrell, L. R. 1 Q. B. 72; 35 L. J. M. C. 74; 12 Jur. N. S. 208; 13 L. T. 364; 14 W. R. 81 | 93 |
| — Staffordshire, 3 East 151 | 9 |
| — —, 23 L. J. M. C. 17; 2 El. & Bl. 689; 18 Jur. 1073 | 11 |
| — —, 7 East 549; 3 Smith 555; 8 R. R. 668 | 14, 291 |
| — —, 12 East 572 | 5 |
| — —, 4 A. & E. 844; 6 N. & M. 477; 2 H. & W. 48 | 415 |
| — Stainforth, 11 Q. B. 66; 3 New Sess. Cas. 53; 17 L. J. M. C. 25; 12 Jur. 95 | 368 |
| — Stephens, L. R. 1 Q. B. 702; 35 L. J. Q. B. 251; 15 Jur. N. S. 961; 14 L. T. 593; 14 W. R. 859 | 104, 142, 144 |
| — Stepney, L. R. 9 Q. B. 383; 43 L. J. M. C. 145; 30 L. T. 808 591 | |
| — Stevens, 1 Moo. C. C. 409 | 371, 467 |
| — Stewart, 8 E. & B. 360; 27 L. J. M. C. 81; 4 Jur. N. S. 187 188, 189 | |

TABLE OF CASES.

cix

| | PAGE |
|---|------------|
| <i>R. v. Stimpson</i> , 4 B. & S. 307; 32 L. J. M. C. 208; 10 Jur. N. S. 41; 9 Cox C. C. 356 | 138 |
| — <i>Stock</i> , 8 A. & E. 405 | 591 |
| — <i>Stoke Bliss</i> , 6 Q. B. 158; D. & M. 135; 13 L. J. M. C. 151; 8 Jur. 536 | 567 |
| — <i>Stoke Damerell</i> , 7 B. & C. 563; 1 M. & R. 458 | 6, 10, 297 |
| — <i>Stone</i> , 23 L. J. M. C. 14; Dears. C. C. 251; 17 Jur. 1106 | 373 |
| — —, 1 East 639 | 547 |
| — <i>Storr</i> , 3 Burr. 1698 | 569 |
| — <i>Stotfold</i> , 4 T. R. 596 | 517 |
| — <i>Strachan</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 463; 41 L. J. Q. B. 210; 26 L. T. 835; 20 W. R. 629 | 328 |
| — <i>Stratford</i> , 11 East 176 | 89 |
| — <i>Stretfield</i> , 32 L. J. M. C. 236; 11 W. R. 736 | 284 |
| — <i>Strugnell</i> , L. R. 1 Q. B. 93 | 466 |
| — <i>Surrey</i> , 6 D. & L. 735 | 415 |
| — <i>Sussex</i> , 4 B. & S. 966; 34 L. J. M. C. 69; 11 Jur. N. S. 300; 11 L. T. 740; 13 W. R. 471 | 14, 268 |
| — —, 7 T. R. 107; 4 R. R. 390 | 268 |
| — —, 15 East 206; 13 R. R. 447 | 268 |
| — <i>Swan</i> , 4 Cox 108 | 586 |
| — <i>Sykes</i> , 1 Q. B. D. 52; 45 L. J. M. C. 39; 33 L. T. 566; 24 W. R. 141 | 175, 510 |
| — <i>Sylvester</i> , 2 B. & S. 322; 31 L. J. M. C. 93 | 176 |
| — <i>Tankard</i> , [1894] 1 Q. B. 548; 63 L. J. M. C. 61; 70 L. T. 42; 42 W. R. 350; 58 J. P. 300; 17 Cox C. C. 719 | 498 |
| — <i>Tart</i> , 1 E. & E. 618; 28 L. J. Q. B. 173; 5 Jur. N. S. 679 | 103 |
| — <i>Tatlock</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 157; 46 L. J. M. C. 7; 35 L. T. 520; 13 Cox 328 | 398 |
| — <i>Tewkesbury</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 639; 37 L. J. Q. B. 288; 18 L. T. 851; 16 W. R. 1200; 9 B. & S. 683 | 115 |
| — <i>Thackwell</i> , 4 B. & C. 62; 6 D. & R. 61 | 268 |
| — <i>Thallman</i> , L. & C. 326; 9 Cox C. C. 388; 33 L. J. M. C. 58; 9 L. T. 425; 12 W. R. 88 | 391 |
| — <i>Thomas</i> , L. R. 2 C. C. 141; 44 L. J. M. C. 42; 31 L. T. 849; 23 W. R. 344 | 371 |
| — —, 4 C. & P. 237 | 395 |
| — <i>Thornhill</i> , 8 C. & P. 574 | 549 |
| — <i>Thurston</i> , 1 Lev. 91 | 595 |
| — <i>Tillingham</i> , 1 B. & Ad. 180 | 164 |
| — <i>Timmins</i> , 30 L. J. M. C. 45; Bell C. C. 276; 8 Cox C. C. 401; 6 Jur. N. S. 1309; 3 L. T. 337; 9 W. R. 36 | 387 |
| — <i>Tinkler</i> , 1 F. & F. 513 | 138 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| R. v. Tithe Commissioners, 14 Q. B. 474 | 334, 336 |
| — Todmorden, 1 Q. B. 185 | 530 |
| — Toke, 8 A. & E. 227 | 368 |
| — Tolley, 3 East 467 | 9 |
| — Tolson, 23 Q. B. D. 168; 58 L. J. M. C. 97; 60 L. T. 899; 37 W. R. 716; 54 J. P. 4; 16 Cox C. C. 629. | 137, 139 |
| — Tone, 1 B. & A. 561 | 455 |
| — Totnes, 11 Q. B. 80 | 517 |
| — Totnes Union, 7 Q. B. 690; 2 New Sess. Cas. 82; 14 L. J. M. C. 148; 9 Jur. 660 | 512 |
| — Townrow, 1 B. & A. 465 | 391 |
| — Trafford, 15 Q. B. 200; 4 New. Sess. Cas. 130; 19 L. J. M. C. 199; 14 Jur. 552 | 268 |
| — Trethowan, 5 Ch. D. 559; 46 L. J. Bkey. 43; 36 L. T. 70; 25 W. R. 399 | 132 |
| — Trew, 2 East P. C. 821 | 142 |
| — Tuchin, 2 Lord Raym. 1066 | 191 |
| — Tucker, 2 Q. B. D. 417; 46 L. J. M. C. 197; 36 L. T. 478; 25 W. R. 697; 13 Cox C. C. 600 | 462 |
| — Turvey, 2 B. & Ald. 520 | 362 |
| — Twyford, 5 A. & E. 430; 6 N. & M. 836 | 500 |
| — Tyler, [1891] 2 Q. B. 588 | 101 |
| — Usworth, 5 A. & E. 261 | 54 |
| — Vandeleeer, 1 Stra. 69 | 498 |
| — Varlo, 1 Cowp. 250 | 424 |
| — Vaughan, L. R. 4 Q. B. 190; 38 L. J. M. C. 49; 17 W. R. 115 | 131 |
| — Verelst, 3 Camp. 432; 14 R. R. 775 | 534 |
| — Vine, L. R. 10 Q. B. 195; 44 L. J. M. C. 60; 31 L. T. 842; 23 W. R. 649; 13 Cox C. C. 43 | 310 |
| — Wagstaff, R. & R. 398 | 388 |
| — Walker, L. R. 10 Q. B. 355; 44 L. J. M. C. 167; 33 L. T. 167 | 569 |
| — Wallis, 5 T. R. 375 | 36, 424 |
| — Walsall, 3 C. L. R. 100. | 176 |
| — Waltham, 3 Cox C. C. 442 | 371 |
| — Warwick, 8 Q. B. 926; 15 L. J. Q. B. 306; 10 Jur. 962 | 97, 406 |
| — Warwickshire, 6 E. & B. 837; 25 L. J. M. C. 119 | 265 |
| — Washbrook, 4 B. & C. 732; 7 D. & K. 221 | 528 |
| — Watson, 7 East 214; 3 Smith 283 | 5 |
| — Watts, 7 A. & E. 461; 2 N. & P. 367 | 268 |
| — —, Dears. C. C. 326; 6 Cox 304; 2 C. L. R. 604; 23 L. J. M. C. 56; 18 Jur. 192 | 397 |

TABLE OF CASES.

cxi

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| R. v. Wavell, 1 Doug. 115 | 173 |
| — —, 1 Moo. C. C. 224 | 375 |
| — Weil, 9 Q. B. D. 701 ; 47 L. T. 630 ; 31 W. R. 60 ; 15 Cox C. C. 189 | 331 |
| — Welland, R. & R. 494 | 371 |
| — Wells, 4 Dowl. 562 | 592 |
| — Weobley, 2 East 68 | 165 |
| — Westbeer, 2 Stra. 1133 | 396 |
| — West Riding, 1 Q. B. 329 | 24 |
| — —, E. B. & E. 713 ; 27 L. J. M. C. 269 ; 5 Jur. N. S. 17 | 268 |
| — —, 2 Q. B. 705 | 415 |
| — —, 5 B. & A. 667 | 415 |
| — —, 4 B. & A. 385 | 487 |
| — —, 1 Q. B. D. 220 ; 45 L. J. M. C. 97 ; 35 L. T. 358 | 586 |
| — —, [1891] 1 Q. B. 722 ; 60 L. J. M. C. 122 | 227 |
| — Weymouth, 4 Q. B. D. 332 ; 38 L. J. M. C. 139 ; 40 L. T. 748 ; 27 W. R. 659 | 115 |
| — White, 14 Q. B. D. 358 ; 54 L. J. M. C. 23 ; 52 L. T. 116 ; 33 W. R. 248 ; 49 J. P. 294 | 502 |
| — Whiteley, 3 H. & N. 143 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 120 | 227 |
| — Widdop, L. R. 2 C. C. 3 ; 42 L. J. M. C. 9 ; 27 L. T. 693 ; 21 W. R. 176 ; 12 Cox C. C. 251 | 548 |
| — Wigg, 2 Salk. 460 | 256 |
| — Wilcock, 7 Q. B. 329 ; 1 New Sess. Cas. 651 ; 14 L. J. M. C. 104 ; 9 Jur. 729 | 57, 353 |
| — Wilkes, 4 Burr. 2527 | 173 |
| — Williams, 1 W. Bl. 95 | 57, 355 |
| — —, 1 East P. C. 424 | 372 |
| — —, 1 Cox C. C. 16 | 388 |
| — Wilmett, 3 Cox C. C. 281 | 141 |
| — Wilson, 3 Q. B. D. 42 ; 37 L. T. 354 ; 25 W. R. 44 ; 13 Cox C. C. 630 | 34 |
| — —, D. & B. 127 ; 26 L. J. M. C. 18 ; 7 Cox C. C. 190 ; 2 Jur. N. S. 1146 | 389 |
| — Wimbledon Local Board, 8 Q. B. D. 459 ; 51 L. J. Q. B. 219 ; 46 L. T. 47 ; 30 W. R. 400 | 116, 117 |
| — Windsor, 7 Q. B. 908 ; 13 L. J. Q. B. 337 | 443 |
| — Winwick, 8 T. R. 454 | 517 |
| — Withyam, 2 C. L. R. 1657 | 174 |
| — Wood, 5 E. & B. 49 | 180 |
| — —, 4 C. & P. 381 | 372 |
| — —, L. R. 4 Q. B. 559 ; 38 L. J. M. C. 144 ; 20 L. T. 654 ; 17 W. R. 850 ; 10 B. & S. 534 | 383 |

| | PAGE |
|---|--------------|
| <i>R. v. Woodland</i> , 1 T. R. 261 ; 3 East 11 n. | 164 |
| — <i>Woodrow</i> , 15 M. & W. 404 ; 2 New Sess. Cas. 346 ; 16 L. J. M. C. 122 | 142 |
| — <i>Woolcock</i> , 5 C. & P. 516 | 373 |
| — <i>Worcestershire</i> , 3 P. & D. 465 ; 12 A. & E. 283 ; 1 Arn. & H. 80 ; 3 Jur. 1050 | 5 |
| — —, 3 E. & B. 488 ; 23 L. J. M. C. 113 | 185 |
| — —, 5 M. & S. 457 | 220 |
| — <i>Worksop Board</i> , 5 B. & S. 951 ; 34 L. J. Q. B. 220 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 1015 ; 10 L. T. 297 ; 12 W. R. 710 | 527 |
| — <i>Wright</i> , 1 A. & E. 446 | 57, 187, 193 |
| — —, 1 Burr. 543 | 571, 573 |
| — <i>Wycombe Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 2 Q. B. 310 ; 36 L. J. Q. B. 121 ; 15 L. T. 601 ; 15 W. R. 489 ; 8 B. & S. 259 | 420 |
| — <i>Wymondham</i> , 2 Q. B. 541 | 96 |
| — <i>Wynn</i> , Bunb. 39 | 191 |
| — <i>York</i> , 6 A. & E. 419 | 85 |
| — <i>York, Archbishop of</i> , Willes 533 | 190 |
| — <i>York and N. Midland Ry. Co.</i> , 22 L. J. Q. B. 41 | 421 |
| — <i>Yorkshire</i> , 5 B. & Ad. 1003 ; 1 A. & E. 563 | 165 |
| — —, 1 Doug. 192 | 268 |
| — —, 3 M. & S. 493 | 548 |
| — <i>Youle</i> , 6 H. & N. 753 ; 30 L. J. M. C. 234 ; 4 L. T. 299 ; 9 W. R. 637 | 255, 260 |
| — <i>Younger</i> , 5 T. R. 449 ; 2 R. R. 638 | 356 |
| — <i>Zulueta</i> , 1 C. & K. 215 | 33, 199 |
| <i>Reus v. Bos</i> , L. R. 5 H. L. 176 ; 40 L. J. Ch. 665 ; 24 L. T. 641 | 114 |
| <i>Reuss Kostritz, Re</i> , 49 L. J. P. & M. 67 | 213 |
| <i>Reya, Ex parte</i> , 6 Ch. D. 332 ; 46 L. J. Bkcy. 122 ; 37 L. T. 17 ; 26 W. R. 193 | 168 |
| <i>Rhodes v. Airedale</i> , 1 C. P. D. 381 ; 45 L. J. C. P. 861 ; 35 L. T. 46 ; 24 W. R. 1153 | 131 |
| — <i>v. Smethurst</i> , 4 M. & W. 42 ; 6 M. & W. 351 ; 1 H. & H. 237 ; 2 Jur. 893 ; 4 Jur. 702 | 287 |
| <i>Rhymney Ry. Co. v. Rhymney Iron Co.</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 146 ; 59 L. J. Q. B. 414 ; 63 L. T. 407 ; 38 W. R. 764 | 570 |
| <i>Richards v. Dyke</i> , 3 Q. B. 256 ; 2 G. & D. 493 ; 6 Jur. 1035 | 219 |
| — <i>v. James</i> , L. R. 2 Q. B. 285 ; 36 L. J. Q. B. 116 ; 16 L. T. 174 ; 15 W. R. 580 ; 8 B. & S. 302 | 295 |
| — <i>v. McBride</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 119 ; 51 L. J. M. C. 15 ; 45 L. T. 677 ; 46 J. P. 247 ; 30 W. R. 121 | 10 |
| <i>Richens v. Wiggins</i> , 3 B. & S. 953 ; 32 L. J. M. C. 144 ; 9 Jur. N. S. 1055 ; 8 L. T. 384 ; 11 W. R. 617 | 233 |

| | PAGE |
|---|-----------------------|
| Richmond v. N. Lond. Ry. Co., L. R. 3 Ch. 679; 37 L. J. Ch. 886 | 422 |
| Richmond Gas Co. v. Richmond Corpn., [1893] 1 Q. B. 56; 62 L. J. Q. B. 172; 67 L. T. 554; 41 W. R. 41; 56 J. P. 776 | 499 |
| Richter v. Hughes, 2 B. & C. 499; 3 D. & R. 788 | 417 |
| Ricket v. Metrop. Ry. Co., L. R. 2 H. L. 175; 36 L. J. Q. B. 205; 16 L. T. 542; 15 W. R. 937 | 131, 449 |
| Ricketts v. Bodenham, 4 A. & E. 433; 6 N. & M. 171; 1 H. & W. 753; 5 D. P. C. 120 | 219 |
| Rider v. Kidder, 10 Ves. 360 | 86 |
| — v. Wood, 29 L. J. M. C. 1; 1 K. & J. 644 | 147 |
| Ridgway v. Stafford, 6 Ex. 404; 22 L. J. Ex. 226 | 231 |
| — v. Warton, 6 H. L. Cas. 238; 27 L. J. Ch. 46; 4 Jur. N. S. 173 | 408 |
| Ridler v. Punter, Cro. Eliz. 291 | 293 |
| Ridsdale v. Clifton, 2 P. D. 322; 46 L. J. P. C. 27; 36 L. T. 865 | 37, 76, 428 |
| Riley v. Read, 4 Ex. D. 100; 48 L. J. Ex. 437; 27 W. R. 414 | 89 |
| Ring v. Cann, 3 M. & W. 343; 1 H. & H. 67; 7 L. J. Ex. 108; 2 Jur. 256 | 473 |
| Ripley v. Waterworth, 7 Ves. 425 | 362 |
| Rishton v. Whatmore, 8 Ch. D. 467; 47 L. J. Ch. 629; 26 W. R. 827 | 408, 409 |
| Ritchie v. Smith, 6 C. B. 462; 18 L. J. C. P. 9; 13 Jur. 63 | 558 |
| River Wear Co. v. Adamson, 2 App. Cas. 743; 47 L. J. Q. B. 193; 37 L. T. 543 | 27, 30, 113, 134, 420 |
| Rivers v. Adams, 3 Ex. D. 361; 48 L. J. Ex. 47; 39 L. T. 39; 27 W. R. 381 | 494 |
| Rix v. Borton, 12 A. & E. 470 | 218, 238 |
| Roberts v. Davey, 4 B. & A. 665; 1 N. & M. 443 | 292 |
| — v. Egerton, L. R. 9 Q. B. 494; 43 L. J. M. C. 135; 30 L. T. 633; 22 W. R. 797 | 43, 450 |
| — v. Humphries, L. R. 8 Q. B. 483; 42 L. J. M. C. 147; 29 L. T. 387; 21 W. R. 885 | 140 |
| — v. Orchard, 2 H. & C. 769; 33 L. J. Ex. 65; 9 L. T. 727; 12 W. R. 253 | 325 |
| — v. Phillips, 4 E. & B. 450; 3 C. L. R. 513; 24 L. J. Q. B. 171; 1 Jur. N. S. 444 | 410 |
| — v. Williams, 2 C. M. R. 561 | 91 |
| — v. Woodward, 25 Q. B. D. 412; 59 L. J. M. C. 129; 63 L. T. 200; 38 W. R. 770; 55 J. P. 116; 17 Cox C. C. 139 | 146 |
| Robertson, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 20 Eq. 733; 44 L. J. Bkcy. 99; 32 L. T. 697; 23 W. R. 906 | 549 |
| Robinson v. Briggs, L. R. 6 Ex. 1; 40 L. J. Ex. 17; 23 L. T. 395 | 93 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Robinson v. Collingwood, 34 L. J. C. P. 18; 17 C. B. N. S. 777; 10 Jur. N. S. 1080; 11 L. T. 313; 13 W. R. 84 | 150 |
| — v. Emerson, 4 H. & C. 352 | 230, 258 |
| — v. Jenkins, 24 Q. B. D. 275; 59 L. J. Q. B. 147; 62 L. T. 439; 38 W. R. 360. | 375 |
| — v. Waddington, 18 L. J. Q. B. 250; 13 Q. B. 753; 13 Jur. 537. | 487 |
| Robson, Re, 19 Ch. D. 156; 45 L. T. 418; 51 L. J. Ch. 337; 30 W. R. 257 | 164 |
| — v. The Kate, 21 Q. B. D. 13; 57 L. J. Q. B. 546; 59 L. T. 557; 36 W. R. 910; 6 Asp. M. C. 330 | 87 |
| Rochdale Canal v. King, 14 Q. B. 122; 18 L. J. Q. B. 293; 14 Jur. 16 | 179, 181 |
| Rochfort v. Atherley, 1 Ex. D. 511; 35 L. T. 602 | 269 |
| Rockett v. Clippingdale, [1891] 2 Q. B. 293; 60 L. J. Q. B. 782; 64 L. T. 641 | 221 |
| Roddam v. Morley, 1 De G. & J. 1; 26 L. J. Ch. 438; 3 Jur. N. S. 449 | 401 |
| Roddy v. Fitzgerald, 6 H. L. Cas. 823. | 77 |
| Roderick v. Aston Local Board, 5 Ch. D. 328; 46 L. J. Ch. 802; 36 L. T. 328; 25 W. R. 403 | 506 |
| Rodrigues v. Melluish, 10 Ex. 110; 24 L. J. Ex. 26 | 7 |
| Rogers, Re, [1894] 1 Q. B. 425; 63 L. J. Q. B. 178; 70 L. T. 107; 1 Manson 387. | 463 |
| Roles v. Rosewell, 5 T. R. 538 | 226 |
| Rolle v. Whyte, L. R. 3 Q. B. 286; 37 L. J. Q. B. 105; 17 L. T. 560; 16 W. R. 593; 8 B. & S. 116 | 48, 453 |
| Rolls v. St. George, Southwark, 14 Ch. D. 785; 49 L. J. Ch. 691; 44 J. P. 680; 43 L. T. 140; 28 W. R. 867 | 130, 435 |
| Romney Marsh v. Trinity House, L. R. 5 Ex. 204; 39 L. J. Ex. 163; 22 L. T. 446; 18 W. R. 869 and L. R. 7 Ex. 247; 41 L. J. Ex. 106 | 582 |
| Rooke's Case, 5 Rep. 100 a | 172 |
| Rose v. Groves, 5 M. & G. 613; 6 Scott N. R. 645; 1 D. & L. 61; 12 L. J. C. P. 251; 7 Jur. 951 | 582 |
| — v. Himeley, 4 Cranch 241 | 196 |
| — v. Miles, 4 M. & S. 101. | 582 |
| Ross v. Price, 1 Ex. D. 269; 45 L. J. Ex. 777; 34 L. T. 535; 24 W. R. 786 | 575 |
| Rosseter v. Cahllman, 8 Ex. 361; 22 L. J. Ex. 128 | 196, 197 |
| Rossiter v. Miller, 3 App. Cas. 1124; 48 L. J. Ch. 10; 39 L. T. 173; 26 W. R. 865. | 409 |
| Roths v. Kirkcaldy Commrs., 7 App. Cas. 702. | 277, 278 |

TABLE OF CASES.

CXV

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Rothschild <i>v.</i> Inland Revenue, [1894] 2 Q. B. 142; 70 L. T. 667; 42 W. R. 542; 58 J. P. 399 | 7 |
| Round <i>v.</i> Bell, 30 Beav. 121; 31 L. J. Ch. 127 | 233 |
| Routledge <i>v.</i> Low, L. R. 3 H. L. 100; 37 L. J. Ch. 454; 18 L. T. N. S. 874; 16 W. R. 1081 | 210 |
| Rowning <i>v.</i> Goodchild, 2 W. Bl. 906 | 576 |
| Royal Aquarium <i>v.</i> Parkinson, [1892] 1 Q. B. 431; 61 L. J. Q. B. 409; 66 L. T. 513; 40 W. R. 450; 56 J. P. 404 | 20 |
| Royal Bank of Scotland <i>v.</i> Tottenham, [1894] 2 Q. B. 715; 64 L. J. Q. B. 99; 71 L. T. 168; 43 W. R. 22 | 171, 273 |
| Royal British Bank <i>v.</i> Turquand, 6 E. & B. 327; 24 L. J. Q. B. 327; 1 Jur. N. S. 1086 | 539 |
| Royal Mail Co. <i>v.</i> Braham, 2 App. Cas. 381; 46 L. J. P. C. 67; 36 L. T. 220; 25 W. R. 651 | 460 |
| Ruabon Co. <i>v.</i> G. W. R., [1893] 1 Ch. 427; 62 L. J. Ch. 483; 68 L. T. 110; 41 W. R. 418 | 503 |
| Ruck <i>v.</i> Williams, 3 H. & N. 308; 27 L. J. Ex. 357 | 131 |
| Ruckmaboye <i>v.</i> Lullooboy, 8 Moo. P. C. C. 4; 5 Moo. Ind. App. 234 | 321 |
| Rumball <i>v.</i> Schmidt, 8 Q. B. D. 603; 46 L. T. 661; 30 W. R. 949; 46 J. P. 567 | 490 |
| Rumsey <i>v.</i> N. E. Ry. Co., 14 C. B. N. S. 641; 32 L. J. C. P. 244; 10 Jur. N. S. 208; 8 L. T. 666; 11 W. R. 911 | 545 |
| Russell, <i>Ex parte</i> , 19 Ves. 165 | 190 |
| —, L. R. 10 Ch. 255; 44 L. J. Bkcy. 42; 32 L. T. 4; 23 W. R. 817 | 172 |
| — <i>v.</i> Cambefort, 23 Q. B. D. 526; 58 L. J. Q. B. 498; 61 L. T. 751; 37 W. R. 707 | 204 |
| — <i>v.</i> Men of Devon, 2 T. R. 667; 1 R. R. 585 | 584 |
| — <i>v.</i> Prat, 1 Leon. 193 | 355 |
| Rustomjee <i>v.</i> Reg., 1 Q. B. D. 487; 2 Q. B. D. 69; 46 L. J. Q. B. 238; 36 L. T. 190; 25 W. R. 333 | 190 |
| Ruther <i>v.</i> Harris, 1 Ex. D. 97; 45 L. J. M. C. 103; 34 L. T. 825 | 389 |
| Ryall <i>v.</i> Rolle, 1 Atk. 165 | 71 |
| — <i>v.</i> Rowles, 1 Ves. 367 | 86 |

S.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Sacker, <i>Ex parte</i> , 22 Q. B. D. 179; 58 L. J. Q. B. 4; 60 L. T. 344; 37 W. R. 204 | 78 |
| Sadler <i>v.</i> Leigh, 4 Camp. 185; 2 Rose 286 | 489 |
| Salaman <i>v.</i> Warner, [1891] 1 Q. B. 734; 60 L. J. Q. B. 624; 39 W. R. 547 | 76 |
| Sale <i>v.</i> Lambert, L. R. 18 Eq. 1; 43 L. J. Ch. 470; 22 W. R. 478 | 409 |

h 2

| | PAGE |
|--|--------------|
| Salford (Mayor) v. Lancashire C. C., 25 Q. B. D. 384 ; 38 W. R. | |
| 661 ; 59 L. J. Q. B. 576 ; 63 L. T. 409 | 494 |
| Salisbury's (Bishop of) Case, 10 Rep. 60 b | 292 |
| Salisbury v. Ray, 8 C. B. N. S. 193 ; 29 L. J. C. P. 225 ; 6 Jur. | |
| N. S. 1117 ; 8 W. R. 462 | 78 |
| Salkeld v. Johnson, 2 C. B. 749 ; 1 Mac. & G. 242 ; 2 Ex. 256 | |
| 38, 57, 68, 69, 71 | |
| Salmon v. Duncombe, 11 App. Cas. 627 ; 55 L. J. P. C. 69 ; 55 | |
| L. T. 446 | 320, 321 |
| Salomons v. Miller, 8 Ex. 778 ; 22 L. J. Ex. 169 ; 17 Jur. 463 | 441 |
| Salt Union v. Woods, [1893] 1 Q. B. 370 ; 68 L. T. 92 ; 62 L. J. M. | |
| C. 75 ; 41 W. R. 301 ; 57 J. P. 201 ; 7 Asp. M. C. 281 | 100 |
| Salters' Co. v. Jay, 3 Q. B. 109 ; 2 G. & D. 414 ; 11 L. J. Q. B. | |
| 175 ; 6 Jur. 803 | 63, 251 |
| Saltmarshe v. Hewett, 1 A. & E. 812 ; 3 N. & M. 656 | 169 |
| Saltoun v. Adv.-Genl., 3 Macq. 659 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 713 ; 8 W. R. | |
| 565 | 83 |
| Sandiman v. Breach, 7 B. & C. 96 ; 9 D. & R. 796 | 469 |
| Sandys, <i>Ex parte</i> , 4 B. & A. 863 ; 1 N. & M. 591 | 514 |
| Sankey, <i>Re</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 17 ; 38 W. R. 533 ; 59 L. J. Q. B. 238 | 495 |
| Santos v. Illidge, 28 L. J. C. P. 317 ; 29 L. J. C. P. 348 ; 8 C. B. | |
| N. S. 861 ; 8 W. R. 705 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 1348 | 34, 199, 203 |
| San Theodoro v. San Theodoro, 5 P. D. 79 ; 49 L. J. P. 20 ; 42 | |
| L. T. 331 | 195 |
| Saunders v. Holborn Bd. of Works, [1895] 1 Q. B. 64 ; 64 L. J. | |
| Q. B. 101 ; 71 L. T. 519 ; 43 W. R. 26 | 584 |
| — v. S. E. Ry. Co., 5 Q. B. D. 456 ; 49 L. J. Q. B. 761 ; 43 | |
| L. T. 281 ; 29 W. R. 56 ; 44 J. P. 781 | 93, 417 |
| Savings Institution v. Makin, 23 Maine 370 | 216 |
| Saxonia, The, Lush 410 ; 31 L. J. Adm. 201 ; 8 Jur. N. S. 315 ; | |
| 10 W. R. 431 ; 6 L. T. 6 ; 15 Moo. P. C. C. 262 | 212 |
| Scadding v. Eyles, 9 Q. B. 858 | 316 |
| — v. Lorant, 13 Q. B. 687 ; 3 H. L. 418 | 534 |
| Scales v. Pickering, 4 Bing. 448 ; 1 M. & P. 195 | 420 |
| Scaltock v. Harston, 1 C. P. D. 106 ; 45 L. J. C. P. 125 ; 34 | |
| L. T. 130 ; 24 W. R. 431 | 507 |
| Scarborough (Mayor of) v. Rural Authority of Scarborough, 1 | |
| Ex. D. 344 ; 34 L. T. 768 | 444 |
| Scatchard v. Johnson, 57 L. J. M. C. 41 ; 52 J. P. 389 | 96, 389 |
| Schmitz, <i>Ex parte</i> , 12 Q. B. D. 509 ; 53 L. J. Ch. 1168 ; 50 L. T. | |
| 747 ; 32 W. R. 812 ; 1 M. B. R. 55 | 379 |
| Schofield, <i>Ex parte</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 428 ; 60 L. J. M. C. 157 ; 64 | |
| L. T. 780 ; 39 W. R. 580 ; 56 J. P. 4 ; 17 Cox C. C. 303 | 101 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Scotch Widows' Fund <i>v.</i> Craig, 20 Ch. D. 208; 51 L. J. Ch. 363; 30 W. R. 463 | 570 |
| Scott <i>v.</i> Avery, 5 H. L. 843; 25 L. J. Ex. 303; 2 Jur. N. S. 815 | 178 |
| — <i>v.</i> Morley, 20 Q. B. D. 120; 57 L. J. Q. B. 43; 57 L. T. 919; | |
| 36 W. R. 67; 52 J. P. 230; 4 M. B. R. 286 | 379, 498 |
| — <i>v.</i> Paquet, L. R. 1 P. C. 552; 36 L. J. P. C. 65; 4 Moo. P. C. C. N. S. 505 | 369 |
| — <i>v.</i> Royal Wax Co., 1 Q. B. D. 404; 45 L. J. Q. B. 586; 34 L. T. 683; 24 W. R. 668 | 460 |
| — <i>v.</i> Uxbridge Ry. Co., L. R. 1 C. P. 596; 35 L. J. C. P. 293; 12 Jur. N. S. 602 | 347 |
| Scrimshire <i>v.</i> Scrimshire, 2 Hagg. Cons. 395 | 197 |
| Scutt <i>v.</i> Freeman, 2 Q. B. D. 177; 46 L. J. Q. B. 173; 35 L. T. 939; 25 W. R. 251 | 247 |
| Selkrig <i>v.</i> Davies, 2 Rose 311; 2 Dow. 250 | 205 |
| Selmes <i>v.</i> Judge, L. R. 6 Q. B. 724; 40 L. J. Q. B. 287; 24 L. T. 905; 19 W. R. 1110 | 325 |
| Senior <i>v.</i> Metrop. Ry. Co., 2 H. & C. 258; 32 L. J. Ex. 225; 9 Jur. N. S. 802; 8 L. T. 544; 11 W. R. 836 | 131 |
| Seward <i>v.</i> The Vera Cruz, 10 App. Cas. 59; 54 L. J. P. 9; 52 L. T. 474; 33 W. R. 477; 49 J. P. 324; 5 Asp. M. C. 386 | 211, 243, 245 |
| Sewell <i>v.</i> Taylor, 7 C. B. N. S. 160; 6 Jur. N. S. 582; 29 L. J. M. C. 50; 1 L. T. 37 | 461 |
| Shackell <i>v.</i> Rosier, 2 Bing. N. C. 634; 3 Scott 59; 2 Hodges 17 | 565 |
| Shaftesbury <i>v.</i> Russell, 1 B. & C. 666; 3 D. & R. 84 | 179 |
| Shaftoe's Charity, <i>Re</i> , 3 App. Cas. 872; 47 L. J. P. C. 98; 38 L. T. 793 | 269 |
| Shardlow <i>v.</i> Cotterell, 20 Ch. D. 90; 51 L. J. Ch. 353; 45 L. T. 572; 30 W. R. 143 | 407 |
| Sharp, <i>Ex parte</i> (R. <i>v.</i> Arnold), 5 B. & S. 322; 33 L. J. Mat. 152; 10 Jur. N. S. 1018; 10 L. T. 458; 12 W. R. 756 | 19 |
| — <i>v.</i> Thomas, 6 Bing. 416 | 163 |
| Sharpe <i>v.</i> Wakefield, 22 Q. B. D. 239; 58 L. J. M. C. 57; 60 L. T. 130; 37 W. R. 187; 53 J. P. 20 and [1891] A. C. 173; 60 L. J. M. C. 73; 64 L. T. 180; 39 W. R. 561; 55 J. P. 197 | 83, 173 |
| Shaw <i>v.</i> Benson, 11 Q. B. D. 563; 52 L. J. Q. B. 575 | 444, 556 |
| — <i>v.</i> G. W. R., [1894] 1 Q. B. 373; 70 L. T. 218; 42 W. R. 285; 58 J. P. 318 | 35 |
| — <i>v.</i> Morley, L. R. 3 Ex. 137; 37 L. J. M. C. 105; 19 L. T. 15; 16 W. R. 763 | 481 |
| — <i>v.</i> Reckitt, [1893] 1 Q. B. 779; 68 L. T. 688; 41 W. R. 497 | 338 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| Shaw v. Simmons, 12 Q. B. D. 117; 53 L. J. Q. B. 29; 32 W. R. 292 | 79 |
| — v. Thompson, 4 Rep. 30 b | 494 |
| Shears v. Jacob, L. R. 1 C. P. 53; 35 L. J. C. P. 241; 14 L. T. 286; 14 W. R. 609. | 496 |
| Sheil, <i>Ex parte</i> , 4 Ch. D. 789; 46 L. J. Bkcy. 62; 36 L. T. 270; 25 W. R. 420 | 400, 401 |
| Sheils v. Rait, 7 C. B. 116 | 465 |
| Shelley's Case, 1 Rep. 93 b | 489 |
| Shelley v. Bethell, 12 Q. B. D. 11; 53 L. J. M. C. 16; 49 L. T. 779; 32 W. R. 276; 48 J. P. 244 | 466 |
| Shepherd v. Hall, 3 Camp. 180 | 166 |
| — v. Hills, 11 Ex. 55; 25 L. J. Ex. 6 | 572, 573 |
| — v. Hodsman, 18 Q. B. 316; 21 L. J. Q. B. 63 | 247 |
| Shepherdess, The, 5 Rob. 266 | 135 |
| Sheppard v. Gosnold, Vaugh. 169 | 424, 425 |
| Sherborn v. Wells, 3 B. & S. 784; 32 L. J. M. C. 179; 8 L. T. 274 | 454 |
| Sherwood v. Ray, 1 Moo. P. C. 353 | 79 |
| Shiels v. G. N. Ry. Co., 30 L. J. Q. B. 331; 7 Jur. N. S. 631; 4 L. T. 479 | 92 |
| Shillito v. Thompson, 1 Q. B. D. 12; 45 L. J. M. C. 18; 33 L. T. 506; 24 W. R. 57 | 418, 478 |
| Shine, <i>Ex parte</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 522; 61 L. J. Q. B. 253; 66 L. T. 146; 40 W. R. 386; 9 M. B. R. 40 | 463 |
| Shipman v. Henbest, 4 T. R. 109. | 180, 183, 590 |
| Shipperdson's Trusts, 49 L. J. Ch. 619 | 416 |
| Shoolbred v. St. Pancras JJ., 24 Q. B. D. 346; 59 L. J. M. C. 63; 62 L. T. 287; 38 W. R. 399; 54 J. P. 231 | 382 |
| Short v. McCarthy, 3 B. & A. 626 | 8 |
| Shortrede v. Cheek, 1 A. & E. 57; 3 N. & M. 366 | 31, 408 |
| Showers v. Chelmsford Union, [1891] 1 Q. B. 339; 60 L. J. M. C. 55; 64 L. T. 755; 39 W. R. 231 | 188 |
| Shrewsbury v. Beazley, 19 C. B. N. S. 651; 34 L. J. C. P. 328; 14 W. R. 31; 13 L. T. 281 | 71 |
| — v. Scott, 6 C. B. N. S. 1, 221; 29 L. J. C. P. 34, 190; 6 Jur. N. S. 452, 472 | 57, 227, 438 |
| Shrimpton v. Sidmouth Ry. Co., L. R. 3 C. P. 80; 17 L. T. 647 347 | |
| Shuttleworth, <i>Re</i> , 9 Q. B. 651; 2 New Sess. Cas. 470; 16 L. J. M. C. 18; 11 Jur. 41 | 523 |
| — v. Le Fleming, 19 C. B. N. S. 687; 34 L. J. C. P. 309; 11 Jur. N. S. 840; 14 W. R. 13 | 41, 464 |
| Sill v. Worswick, 1 H. Bl. 665; 2 R. R. 816 | 205 |

TABLE OF CASES.

cxix

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Sillence, <i>Ex parte</i> , 7 Ch. D. 238 ; 47 L. J. Bkcy. 87; 37 L. T. 676; 26 W. R. 129 | 488 |
| Simmons v. Woodward, [1892] App. Cas. 100; 61 L. J. Ch. 252 ; 66 L. T. 534 ; 40 W. R. 641 | 91 |
| Simpkin, <i>Ex parte</i> , 2 E. & E. 392 ; 29 L. J. M. C. 23 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 144 | 490 |
| — v. Birmingham JJ., L. R. 7 Q. B. 482 ; 21 L. J. M. C. 102 ; 26 L. T. 620 ; 20 W. R. 702 | 12 |
| Simpson v. Blues, L. R. 7 C. P. 290 ; 41 L. J. C. P. 121 ; 26 L. T. 697 ; 20 W. R. 680 | 25, 186 |
| — v. Ready, 11 M. & W. 346 | 586 |
| — v. S. Staffordshire Waterworks, 34 L. J. Ch. 380 ; 4 De G. J. & S. 679 ; 11 Jur. N. S. 453 ; 13 W. R. 729 | 420 |
| — v. Unwin, 3 B. & Ad. 134 | 322 |
| Sims v. Doughty, 5 Ves. 243 | 215 |
| — v. Pay, 58 L. J. M. C. 39 ; 60 L. T. 602 ; 53 J. P. 420 ; 16 Cox C. C. 609 | 258 |
| — v. Thomas, 12 A. & E. 536 ; 4 P. & D. 233 ; 4 Jur. 1181 86, 110, 233 | 249 |
| Simson v. Moss, 2 B. & Ad. 543 | 249 |
| Sinnott v. Whitechapel, 3 C. B. N. S. 674 ; 27 L. J. C. P. 177 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 263 | 268 |
| Skinner v. Usher, L. R. 7 Q. B. 423 ; 41 L. J. Q. B. 158 ; 26 L. T. 430 ; 20 W. R. 659 | 454, 461 |
| Skinner & Co. v. Shew & Co., [1893] 1 Ch. 413 ; 62 L. J. Ch. 196 ; 67 L. T. 696 ; 41 W. R. 217 | 476 |
| Slattery v. Naylor, 13 App. Cas. 446 ; 57 L. J. P. C. 73 ; 59 L. T. 41 ; 36 W. R. 897 | 419 |
| Smale v. Burr, L. R. 8 C. P. 64 ; 42 L. J. C. P. 20 ; 27 L. T. 555 ; 21 W. R. 193 | 170 |
| Small v. Nat. Prov. Bk., [1894] 1 Ch. 686 ; 63 L. J. Ch. 270 ; 70 L. T. 492 ; 42 W. R. 378 | 132 |
| Smith, <i>Ex parte</i> , 3 Q. B. D. 374 ; 26 W. R. 682 ; 47 L. J. M. C. 104 175, 510 —, (<i>v. Alexander v. Vaughan</i>) | 204 |
| — <i>Re</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 536 ; 59 L. J. Q. B. 554 ; 38 W. R. 744 ; 7 M. B. R. 246 | 160 |
| —, 2 Ex. D. 47 ; 46 L. J. Q. B. 75 ; 35 L. T. 858 | 191 |
| —, [1893] 2 Ch. 1 ; 62 L. J. Ch. 336 ; 68 L. T. 337 ; 41 W. R. 289 ; 57 J. P. 516 | 233 |
| — v. Adams, 5 De G. M. & G. 712 ; 24 L. J. Ch. 258 ; 18 Jur. 968 ; 18 Beav. 499 | 41, 109 |
| — v. Baker, [1891] App. Cas. 349 ; 60 L. J. Q. B. 691 ; 65 L. T. 467 ; 55 J. P. 660 | 84 |

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------------|
| Smith v. Barnham , 1 Ex. D. 419; 34 L. T. 774 | 472 |
| — v. Birmingham Guardians , 7 E. & B. 483; 26 L. J. M. C. 105; 3 Jur. N. S. 769 | 188 |
| — v. Brown , L. R. 6 Q. B. 729; 40 L. J. Q. B. 214; 24 L. T. 808; 19 W. R. 1165 | 47, 186, 445 |
| — v. Fox , 6 Hare 386 | 8 |
| — v. G. W. Ry. Co. , 3 App. Cas. 165; 47 L. J. Ch. 97; 37 L. T. 645; 26 W. R. 130 | 277 |
| — v. Hudson , 34 L. J. Q. B. 145; 6 B. & S. 431; 11 Jur. N. S. 622; 12 L. T. 377; 13 W. R. 683 | 409 |
| — v. Huggett , 11 C. B. N. S. 55; K. & G. 434; 31 L. J. C. P. 38; 8 Jur. N. S. 617; 5 L. T. 357; 10 W. R. 80 | 523 |
| — v. Jones , 1 B. & A. 328 | 529 |
| — v. Keats , 4 Hagg. 279 | 189 |
| — v. Kirby , 1 Q. B. D. 131; 24 W. R. 207 | 412 |
| — v. Lindo , 4 C. B. N. S. 395; 5 Id. 587; 27 L. J. C. P. 196, 335; 4 Jur. N. S. 974 | 49, 381, 424, 562 |
| — v. Mawhood , 14 M. & W. 452; 15 L. J. Ex. 149 | 563 |
| — v. R. , 3 App. Cas. 614; 47 L. J. P. C. 51; 38 L. T. 233 | 512 |
| — v. Sparrow , 4 Bing. 84; 2 C. & P. 544 | 556 |
| — v. Tilley , 1 Keb. 712 | 426 |
| — v. Walton , 3 C. P. D. 109; 47 L. J. M. C. 45; 37 L. T. 437 | 399 |
| — v. Whitmore , 1 Hem. & M. 576; 32 L. J. Ch. 218; 10 Jur. N. S. 65; 10 L. T. 128 | 179 |
| — v. Wood , 24 Q. B. D. 23; 59 L. J. Q. B. 5; 61 L. T. 870; 38 W. R. 138; 54 J. P. 324 | 373 |
| Smith's Estate, Re , 35 Ch. D. 589; 56 L. J. Ch. 726; 56 L. T. 850; 35 W. R. 514; 51 J. P. 692 | 246 |
| Smithett v. Blythe , 1 B. & A. 509 | 439 |
| Smyth v. North , L. R. 7 Ex. 242; 41 L. J. Ex. 103; 20 W. R. 683 | 154 |
| Sneed v. Com. , 6 Dana 339 (Kentucky) | 4 |
| Sneezum v. Marshall , 7 M. & W. 417; 9 D. P. C. 267 | 402 |
| Snow v. Hill , 14 Q. B. D. 588; 54 L. J. M. C. 95; 52 L. T. 859; 49 J. P. 440; 15 Cox C. C. 737 | 166, 394, 481 |
| Soc. Prop. Gospel v. Wheeler , 2 Gallison 139 | 299 |
| Solarte v. Melville , 1 Man. & Ry. 204 | 158 |
| Somerset (Duke of), Re , 34 Ch. D. 465; 56 L. J. Ch. 733; 56 L. T. 145; 35 W. R. 273. | 124 |
| Somerset v. Hare , 12 Q. B. D. 360; 53 L. J. M. C. 77; 48 J. P. 327 | 146, 389 |
| — v. Wade , [1894] 1 Q. B. 574; 63 L. J. M. C. 126; 70 L. T. 432; 42 W. R. 399; 58 J. P. 231 | 143, 146, 389 |

TABLE OF CASES.

CXXI

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| Southam, <i>Re</i> , 19 Ch. 169; 51 L. J. Ch. 207; 45 L. T. 635; 30 W. R. 126 | 487 |
| Southampton Bridge Co. v. Southampton L. Bd., 8 E. & B. 803; 27 L. J. Q. B. 128; 3 Jur. N. S. 1261 | 504 |
| Southampton Dock Co. v. Richards, 1 M. & G. 448; 1 Scott New Rep. 219; 2 Rly. Cas. 215 | 536 |
| South of Ireland Colliery v. Waddle, L. R. 3 C. P. 463; 37 L. J. C. P. 211; 18 L. T. 405; 16 W. R. 756 and L. R. 4 C. P. 617; 38 L. J. C. P. 338; 17 W. R. 896 | 496 |
| S. E. Ry. Co. v. Rly. Commrs., 6 Q. B. D. 586; 50 L. J. Q. B. 201; 44 L. T. 203; 45 J. P. 388 | 414 |
| Southport (Mayor of) v. Morriss, [1893] 1 Q. B. 359; 62 L. J. M. C. 47; 57 J. P. 231; 41 W. R. 382; 68 L. T. 221; 7 Asp. M. C. 279 | 100 |
| South Staffordshire Tramways Co. v. Assurance Assn., [1891] 1 Q. B. 402; 60 L. J. Q. B. 260; 64 L. T. 279; 39 W. R. 292; 55 J. P. 372 | 486 |
| South Yorkshire Ry. Co. v. G. N. Ry. Co., 9 Ex. 55 | 496, 497, 525 |
| Sowerby v. Smith, L. R. 9 C. P. 524; 43 L. J. C. P. 290; 31 L. T. 309; 23 W. R. 79 | 400, 436 |
| Spackman, <i>Re</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 728; 59 L. J. Q. B. 306; 62 L. T. 849; 38 W. R. 497; 7 M. B. R. 100 | 77 |
| Spackman's Case, 1 McN. & G. 170 | 475 |
| Spencer v. Metrop. Bd. of Works, 22 Ch. D. 142; 52 L. J. Ch. 249; 47 L. T. 459; 31 W. R. 347 | 446 |
| Spice v. Bacon, 2 Ex. D. 463; 46 L. J. Ex. 713; 36 L. T. 896; 25 W. R. 840 | 522 |
| — v. Barnard, 1 E. & E. 874; 28 L. J. M. C. 176; 5 Jur. N. S. 961; 7 W. R. 467 | 127 |
| Spilsbury v. Micklethwaite, 1 Taunt. 146; 9 R. R. 717 | 507 |
| Spittall v. Brook, 18 Q. B. D. 426; 55 L. J. Q. B. 48; 56 L. T. 364; 35 W. R. 520; 1 Fox 22 | 90 |
| Spyve v. Topham, 3 East 115; 6 R. R. 559 | 351 |
| St. Cross v. Howard, 6 T. R. 338 | 84 |
| St. Gobain Co. v. Hoyer mann, [1893] 2 Q. B. 96; 62 L. J. Q. B. 485; 69 L. T. 329; 41 W. R. 563 | 204 |
| St. John's, Hampstead, v. Cotton, 12 App. Cas. 6; 56 L. J. Q. B. 225; 56 L. T. 1; 35 W. R. 505; 51 J. P. 340 | 3 |
| St. Juan Nepomuceno, 1 Hagg. 265 | 203 |
| St. Leonard's v. Franklin, 3 C. P. D. 377; 47 L. J. C. P. 727; 39 L. T. 122; 26 W. R. 882 | 85, 460 |
| St. Lokey v. Green, 9 C. B. N. S. 370; 2 F. & F. 106; 30 L. J. C. P. 191; 7 Jur. N. S. 394; 3 L. T. 297; 9 W. R. 119 | 433 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| St. Mary v. Radcliffe, 1 Stra. 60 | 89 |
| St. Pancras v. Batterbury, 2 C. B. N. S. 477; 26 L. J. C. P. 243 ; 3 Jur. N. S. 1106 | 183, 573 |
| St. Sepulchre, <i>Ex parte</i> , 33 L. J. Ch. 372 | 7, 18 |
| St. Werburgh v. Hutchinson, 5 Ex. D. 19; 49 L. J. M. C. 23 ; 42 L. T. 153; 28 W. R. 153 | 12 |
| Stable v. Dixon, 6 East 163; 2 Smith 278; 8 R. R. 441 | 185 |
| Stacey v. Lintell, 4 Q. B. D. 291; 48 L. J. M. C. 108; 40 L. T. 553; 27 W. R. 551 | 96 |
| Stainton v. Woolrych, 23 Beav. 225; 26 L. J. Ch. 300; 3 Jur. N. S. 257 | 504 |
| Stallard v. Marks, 3 Q. B. D. 412; 47 L. J. M. C. 91; 38 L. T. 566; 26 W. R. 694 | 161 |
| Stamp, <i>Ex parte</i> , 1 De G. 345 | 136 |
| Staney v. Chilworth Gunpowder Co., 24 Q. B. D. 90; 62 L. T. 73; 38 W. R. 204; 17 Cox C. C. 55; 59 L. J. M. C. 13; 54 J. P. 436 | 148 |
| Stanley v. Dodd, 1 D. & R. 397; 2 D. & R. 800 | 394 |
| — v. Western Insurance Co., L. R. 3 Ex. 71; 37 L. J. Exch. 215; 16 W. R. 369; 17 L. T. N. S. 513. | 83 |
| — v. Wharton, 9 Pri. 301; 10 Pri. 138 | 574 |
| Stanton v. Lambert, 39 Ch. D. 626; 57 L. J. Ch. 927; 59 L. T. 429 | 498 |
| Stapleton v. Haymen, 2 H. & C. 918; 33 L. J. Ex. 170; 10 Jur. N. S. 497; 12 W. R. 317 | 524 |
| Stead v. Carey, 1 C. B. 496; 14 L. J. C. P. 177; 9 Jur. 511 | 310 |
| Steavenson v. Oliver, 8 M. & W. 234; 5 Jur. 1064 | 586 |
| Steel v. Dartford Loc. Bd., 60 L. J. Q. B. 256 | 584 |
| — v. Henley, 1 C. & P. 574 | 562 |
| Steele v. Brannan, L. R. 7 C. P. 261; 41 L. J. M. C. 85; 26 L. T. 509; 20 W. R. 607. | 149 |
| — v. Midland Ry. Co., L. R. 1 Ch. 282; 12 Jur. N. S. 218 ; 14 L. T. 3; 14 W. R. 367 | 39 |
| Steinson v. Heath, 3 Lev. 400 | 572 |
| Stephens v. Robinson, 2 C. & J. 209 | 561 |
| Stephenson v. Higginson, 3 H. L. C. 638 | 375 |
| Stettin, The, Br. & L. 199; 31 L. J. Adm. 208; 6 L. T. 613 | 452 |
| Stevens, <i>Ex parte</i> , L. R. 20 Eq. 786; 44 L. J. Bkey. 136; 33 L. T. 135; 23 W. R. 908. | 170 |
| — v. Evans, 2 Burr. 1152 | 572 |
| — v. Gourley, 7 C. B. N. S. 99; 1 F. & F. 498; 27 L. J. C. P. 1; 6 Jur. N. S. 147; 1 L. T. 33 | 519, 554 |
| — v. Jeacocke, 11 Q. B. 731; 17 L. J. Q. B. 163; 12 Jur. 477 | 275, 578 |

TABLE OF CASES.

cxxiii

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| <i>Stevens v. Watson</i> , 1 Salk. 45 | 257 |
| <i>Steward v. Greaves</i> , 10 M. & W. 711 ; 2 D. N. S. 485 ; 12 L. J. Ex. 109 ; 6 Jur. 1116 | 226 |
| <i>Stewart v. Lawton</i> , 1 Bing. 377 | 424 |
| <i>Stock and Share Auction, &c. Co., Re</i> , [1894] 1 Ch. 736; 63 L. J. Ch. 245 ; 70 L. T. 235 ; 42 W. R. 300 ; 1 Manson 125 | 450 |
| <i>Stocker v. Warner</i> , 1 C. B. 167 ; 9 Jur. 136 | 305 |
| <i>Stockton and Darlington Ry. Co. v. Barrett</i> , 11 Cl. & F. 602 ; 8 Scott N. R. 641 | 402, 420 |
| — <i>v. Brown</i> , 9 H. L. Cas. 246 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 1168 ; 8 W. R. 708 | 175 |
| <i>Stokes v. Grissell</i> , 14 C. B. 678 ; 2 C. L. R. 730 ; 23 L. J. C. P. 141 ; 18 Jur. 519 | 491 |
| <i>Stoke's Trusts</i> , L. R. 13 Eq. 333 ; 41 L. J. Ch. 290 ; 26 L. T. 181 ; 20 W. R. 396 | 416 |
| <i>Stone v. Dean, E. B. & E.</i> 504 ; 27 L. J. Q. B. 319 ; 4 Jur. N. S. 534 | 542 |
| — <i>v. Yeovil</i> , 1 C. P. D. 691 ; 45 L. J. C. P. 657 ; 34 L. T. 871 ; 24 W. R. 1073 and 2 C. P. D. 99 ; 46 L. J. C. P. 137 ; 36 L. T. 279 ; 25 W. R. 240 | 329 |
| <i>Storie v. Winchester</i> , 17 C. B. 653 ; 19 L. J. C. P. 217 | 297 |
| <i>Story, Ex parte</i> , 3 Q. B. D. 166 ; 47 L. J. Q. B. 266 ; 38 L. T. 29 ; 26 W. R. 329 | 184 |
| <i>Stoy v. Rees</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 748 ; 59 L. J. Q. B. 310 ; 63 L. T. 49 ; 38 W. R. 683 | 91 |
| <i>Stradling v. Morgan</i> , Plow. 204 | 30, 85 |
| <i>Stretton's Brewery v. Mayor of Derby</i> , [1894] 1 Ch. 431 ; 63 L. J. Ch. 135 ; 69 L. T. 791 ; 42 W. R. 583 | 503 |
| <i>Strother v. Hutchinson</i> , 4 Bing. N. C. 83 ; 5 Scott 346 ; 6 D. P. C. 238 ; 3 Hodges 294 ; 2 Jur. 16 | 357 |
| <i>Stroud v. Wandsworth Bd. of Works</i> , [1894] 2 Q. B. 1 ; 63 L. J. M. C. 88 ; 70 L. T. 190 ; 42 W. R. 355 ; 58 J. P. 652 | 175 |
| <i>Stuart v. Jones</i> , 1 El. & Bl. 22 ; 22 L. J. Q. B. 1 ; 16 Jur. 1020 | 252 |
| — <i>v. Laird</i> , 1 Cranch 299 | 429 |
| <i>Studds v. Watson</i> , 28 Ch. D. 305 ; 54 L. J. Ch. 626 ; 52 L. T. 129 ; 33 W. R. 118 | 408 |
| <i>Sturgis v. Darrell</i> , 4 H. & N. 622 ; 28 L. J. Ex. 366 and 6 H. & N. 120 ; 29 L. J. Ex. 472 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 1351 ; 8 W. R. 653 | 363, 433 |
| <i>Suche & Co., Re</i> , 1 Ch. D. 48 ; 45 L. J. Ch. 12 ; 33 L. T. 774 ; 24 W. R. 184 | 306 |
| <i>Sulley v. Atty.-Genl.</i> , 5 H. & N. 711 ; 29 L. J. Ex. 464 ; 6 Jur. N. S. 1018 ; 8 W. R. 472 | 207 |
| <i>Summers v. Holborn Bd. of Works</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 612 ; 62 L. J. M. C. 81 ; 57 J. P. 326 ; 68 L. T. 226 ; 41 W. R. 445 | 261 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------------|
| <i>Sunderland v. Sussex</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 99; 51 L. J. M. C. 33; 46 L. T. 98; 30 W. R. 337; 46 J. P. 375 | 302 |
| <i>Sunderland Local M. Bd. v. Frankland</i> , L. R. 8 Q. B. 18; 42 L. J. Q. B. 13; 28 L. T. 18 | 499 |
| <i>Supervisors v. U. S.</i> , 4 Wallace 446 | 346, 348 |
| <i>Surtees v. Ellison</i> , 9 B. & C. 752 | 585 |
| <i>Sussex Peerage</i> , 11 Cl. & F. 85; 8 Jur. 793 | 1, 4, 195, 198, 399 |
| <i>Sutton v. Clarke</i> , 6 Taunt. 29; 1 Marsh 429 | 504 |
| — <i>v. Sutton</i> , 22 Ch. D. 513; 52 L. J. Ch. 333; 48 L. T. 95; 31 W. R. 369 | 56, 59, 233 |
| <i>Sutton's Case</i> , 10 Rep. 31 a | 78 |
| <i>Swaine v. Wilson</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 252; 59 L. J. Q. B. 76; 62 L. T. 309; 38 W. R. 261; 54 J. P. 484 | 567 |
| <i>Sweeney v. Spooner</i> , 3 B. & S. 329; 32 L. J. M. C. 82; 9 Jur. N. S. 691; 7 L. T. 623; 11 W. R. 264 | 374 |
| <i>Swift v. Jewsbury</i> , L. R. 9 Q. B. 301; 43 L. J. Q. B. 56; 30 L. T. 31; 22 W. R. 319 | 104 |
| — <i>v. Swift</i> , 3 Knapp 257 | 198 |
| <i>Swindell v. Bulkeley</i> , 18 Q. B. D. 250; 56 L. J. Q. B. 613; 56 L. T. 38; 35 W. R. 189 | 360 |
| <i>Syred v. Carruthers</i> , E. B. & E. 469; 27 L. J. M. C. 273; 4 Jur. N. S. 949 | 543 |

T.

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Tabernacle Bldg. Soc. v. Knight</i> , [1892] A. C. 298; 62 L. J. Q. B. 50; 67 L. T. 483; 56 J. P. 709 | 225 |
| <i>Taff Vale Ry. v. Davis</i> , [1894] 1 Q. B. 43; 63 L. J. Q. B. 347; 42 W. R. 215 | 39 |
| <i>Talbot v. Shrewsbury</i> , L. R. 16 Eq. 26; 42 L. J. Ch. 877; 21 W. R. 473 | 233 |
| <i>Tarrant v. Baker</i> , 14 C. B. 199; 2 C. L. R. 78; 23 L. J. C. P. 21; 18 Jur. 15 | 325 |
| <i>Tassel v. Ovenden</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 383; 46 L. J. M. C. 228; 36 L. T. 696; 25 W. R. 692 | 272 |
| <i>Tatam v. Reeve</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 44; 62 L. J. Q. B. 30; 67 L. T. 683; 41 W. R. 174; 57 J. P. 118 | 445 |
| <i>Tate v. Wellings</i> , 3 T. R. 531 | 159 |
| <i>Tattle v. Grimwood</i> , 3 Bing. 496 | 585 |
| <i>Tawney's Case</i> , 2 Salk. 531 | 284 |
| <i>Taylor, Re</i> , 10 Sim. 291 | 110 |
| —, 4 Ch. D. 159; 46 L. J. Ch. 399; 36 L. T. 169; 25 W. R. 69 | 173 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Taylor v. Caldwell , 3 B. & S. 826; 32 L. J. Q. B. 164; 8 L. T. 356; 11 W. R. 726 | 541 |
| — v. Crowland Gas Co. , 11 Ex. 1; 2 C. L. R. 1247; 23 L. J. Ex. 254; 18 Jur. 913 | 92 |
| — v. — , 10 Ex. 293; 2 C. L. R. 1247; 23 L. J. Ex. 254; 18 Jur. 913 | 561 |
| — v. Goodwin , 4 Q. B. D. 228; 48 L. J. M. C. 104; 40 L. T. 458; 27 W. R. 489. | 382 |
| — v. Greenhalgh , 24 W. R. 311, reversing L. R. 9 Q. B. 487; 43 L. J. Q. B. 168; 31 L. T. 184; 23 W. R. 4 | 583 |
| — v. Humphreys , 17 C. B. 539; 10 C. B. N. S. 429; 30 L. J. M. C. 242; 7 Jur. N. S. 1288; 4 L. T. 514; 9 W. R. 705 | 93 |
| — v. Newman , 4 B. & S. 93; 32 L. J. M. C. 189; 9 Cox C. C. 314; 8 L. T. 424; 11 W. R. 752 | 57, 127 |
| — v. Oldham Corporation , 4 Ch. D. 395; 46 L. J. Ch. 105; 35 L. T. 696; 25 W. R. 303 | 55, 232 |
| — v. Oram , 1 H. & C. 370; 31 L. J. M. C. 252; 8 Jur. 748; 7 L. T. 68; 10 W. R. 800 | 462 |
| — v. Phillips , 3 East 155; 6 R. R. 575 | 548 |
| — v. Rogers , 50 L. J. M. C. 132; 45 L. T. 314 | 223 |
| — v. St. Mary Abbott , L. R. 6 C. P. 309; 40 L. J. C. P. 45; 23 L. T. 493; 19 W. R. 109; 1 Hop. & C. 421 | 90 |
| — v. Smetten , 11 Q. B. D. 207; 52 L. J. M. C. 101; 48 J. P. 36 | 481 |
| — v. Taylor , 1 Ch. D. 426; 3 Ch. D. 145; 45 L. J. Ch. 373, 848; 25 W. R. 279; 35 L. T. 450 | 414 |
| Teather, Ex parte , 1 L. M. & P. 7 | 514 |
| Tempest v. Kilner , 3 C. B. 249 | 462 |
| Tennant v. Bell , 9 Q. B. 684; 16 L. J. M. C. 31; 10 Jur. 946 | 488 |
| — v. Rawlings , 4 C. P. D. 133; 27 W. R. 682. | 526, 544 |
| — v. Smith , [1892] A. C. 150; 61 L. J. P. C. 11; 66 L. T. 327; 56 J. P. 596 | 402 |
| — v. Union Bank of Canada , [1894] App. Cas. 31; 63 L. J. P. C. 25; 69 L. T. 774 | 192 |
| Tepper v. Nichols , 18 C. B. N. S. 121; 1 H. & P. 202; 34 L. J. C. P. 61; 11 Jur. N. S. 18; 11 L. T. 509; 13 W. R. 270 | 507 |
| Ternan, Re , 33 L. J. M. C. 201; 5 B. & S. 645; 9 Cox C. C. 522; 11 Jur. N. S. 34; 10 L. T. 499; 12 W. R. 858 | 95 |
| Terrell, Re , 4 Ch. D. 293; 47 L. J. Bkey. 60; 38 L. T. 243; 26 W. R. 470 | 172 |
| Tewkesbury v. Twining , 2 Bott. 3 | 164 |
| Thacker v. Hardy , 4 Q. B. D. 685; 48 L. J. Q. B. 289; 39 L. T. 595; 27 W. R. 158. | 159 |

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Thames, Conservators of, <i>v.</i> Hall, L. R. 3 C. P. 415; 37 L. J. C. P. 163; 18 L. T. 361; 16 W. R. 971 | 243 |
| — <i>Haven Co. v. Rose</i> , 4 M. & G. 552; 2 D. N. S. 104; 5 Scott N. R. 524; 12 L. J. C. P. 90; 3 Railw. Cas. 177 | 153 |
| Theberge <i>v.</i> Laudry, 2 App. Cas. 102; 46 L. J. P. C. 1; 35 L. T. 640; 25 W. R. 216 | 192 |
| Theta, The, [1894] P. 280; 63 L. J. P. 160; 71 L. T. 25; 43 W. R. 160 | 47 |
| Thistleton <i>v.</i> Frewer, 31 L. J. Ex. 230 | 309 |
| Thoday, <i>Ex parte</i> , 2 Ch. D. 229, 797; 45 L. J. Bkcy. 64, 159; 34 L. T. 261, 705 | 268 |
| Thomas, <i>Re</i> , 21 Q. B. D. 380; 57 L. J. Q. B. 574; 59 L. T. 447; 36 W. R. 375; 5 M. B. R. 153 | 191 |
| — <i>Doe d., v. Beynon</i> , 12 A. & E. 431; 4 P. & D. 193 | 31 |
| — <i>v. Brown</i> , 1 Q. B. D. 714; 45 L. J. Q. B. 811; 35 L. T. 237; 24 W. R. 821 | 410 |
| — <i>v. Desanges</i> , 2 B. & A. 586 | 488 |
| — <i>v. Quartermaine</i> , 18 Q. B. D. 685; 56 L. J. Q. B. 340; 57 L. T. 537; 35 W. R. 555; 51 J. P. 516 | 503, 548 |
| — <i>v. R.</i> , L. R. 10 Q. B. 44; 44 L. J. Q. B. 9; 31 L. T. 439; 23 W. R. 176 | 191 |
| — <i>v. Stephenson</i> , 2 E. & B. 108; 22 L. J. Q. B. 258; 17 Jur. 597 | 384 |
| Thompson <i>v.</i> Brighton, Mayor of, [1894] 1 Q. B. 332; 63 L. J. Q. B. 181; 70 L. T. 206; 42 W. R. 161; 58 J. P. 297 | 584 |
| — <i>v. Farrer</i> , 9 Q. B. D. 372; 51 L. J. Q. B. 534; 47 L. T. 117; 4 Asp. M. C. 562 | 42 |
| — <i>v. Harvey</i> , 4 H. & N. 254; 28 L. J. M. C. 163 | 538 |
| — <i>v. Hill</i> , L. R. 5 C. P. 564; 39 L. J. C. P. 264; 22 L. T. 820; 18 W. R. 1070 | 509 |
| Thomson <i>v.</i> Adv.-Gen., 12 Cl. & F. 1; 9 Jur. 217 | 206 |
| Thorburn <i>v.</i> Barnes, L. R. 2 C. P. 384; 36 L. J. C. P. 184; 16 L. T. 10; 15 W. R. 623 | 512 |
| Thorley, <i>Re</i> , [1891] 2 Ch. 613; 60 L. J. Ch. 537; 64 L. T. 515; 39 W. R. 565 | 402, 406 |
| Thorne, <i>Ex parte</i> , 3 Ch. D. 457; 45 L. J. Bkcy. 158; 35 L. T. 532; 25 W. R. 186 | 433 |
| — <i>v. Heard</i> , [1894] 1 Ch. 599; 63 L. J. Ch. 356; 70 L. T. 541; 42 W. R. 274 | 8 |
| Thorpe <i>v.</i> Adams, L. R. 6 C. P. 125; 30 L. J. M. C. 52; 23 L. T. 810; 19 W. R. 352 | 243 |
| — <i>v. Brown</i> , L. R. 2 H. L. 220 | 91 |
| Thursby <i>v.</i> Briercliffe, [1894] 2 Q. B. 11; [1895] A. C. 32; 63 L. J. M. C. 137; 70 L. T. 618; 42 W. R. 450; 58 J. P. 428 | 460 |

TABLE OF CASES.

cxxxvii

| | PAGE |
|---|---------|
| <i>Thwaites v. Wilding</i> , 12 Q. B. D. 4; 53 L. J. Q. B. 1; 49 L. T. 396; 32 W. R. 80 | 523 |
| <i>Tidd, Re</i> , [1893] 3 Ch. 154; 62 L. J. Ch. 915; 69 L. T. 255; 42 W. R. 25 | 360 |
| <i>Tidey v. Mollett</i> , 16 C. B. N. S. 298; 33 L. J. C. P. 235; 10 Jur. N. S. 800; 10 L. T. 380; 12 W. R. 802 | 457 |
| <i>Timms v. Williams</i> , 3 Q. B. 413; 2 G. & D. 621; 11 L. J. Q. B. 210; 6 Jur. 1012 | 182 |
| <i>Tisdell v. Coombe</i> , 7 A. & E. 788; 3 N. & P. 29; 1 W. W. & H. 5; 2 Jur 32 | 471 |
| <i>Tobacco-pipe Makers v. Woodroffe</i> , 7 B. & C. 838; 5 D. & R. 530 | 46, 236 |
| <i>Tobin v. Reg.</i> , 14 C. B. N. S. 505; 32 L. J. C. P. 216; 9 Jur. N. S. 1130; 8 L. T. 392, 730; 11 W. R. 701, 915 | 191 |
| <i>Todd v. Robinson</i> , 14 Q. B. D. 739; 54 L. J. Q. B. 47; 52 L. T. 120; 49 J. P. 278 | 394 |
| <i>Tomkins v. Ashby</i> , 6 B. & C. 541; 9 D. & R. 543 | 403 |
| <i>Tomlinson v. Bullock</i> , 4 Q. B. D. 230; 48 L. J. M. C. 95; 40 L. T. 459; 27 W. R. 552 | 489 |
| — <i>v. Consolidated Credit Corpn.</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 135; 62 L. T. 162; 38 W. R. 118; 54 J. P. 644 | 151 |
| <i>Tompson v. Browne</i> , 3 M. & K. 32 | 168 |
| <i>Toms v. Wilson</i> , 4 B. & S. 442; 32 L. J. Q. B. 382; 10 Jur. N. S. 201; 7 L. T. 421; 11 W. R. 117 | 487 |
| <i>Tone Conservators v. Ash</i> , 10 B. & C. 349 | 494 |
| <i>Toomer v. London Ch. & D. Ry. Co.</i> , 2 Ex. D. 450; 47 L. J. Ex. 276; 37 L. T. 161; 26 W. R. 31 | 415 |
| <i>Tottenham Board v. Rowell</i> , 1 Ex. D. 514; 46 L. J. Ex. 432; 25 W. R. 135 | 270 |
| <i>Tontill v. Douglas</i> , 33 L. J. Q. B. 66; 8 L. T. 426 | 588 |
| <i>Towler v. Chatterton</i> , 6 Bing. 258; 3 M. & P. 619 | 311 |
| <i>Towns v. Wentworth</i> , 11 Moo. 543 | 77 |
| <i>Townsend v. Deacon</i> , 3 Exch. 706; 6 D. & L. 659; 18 L. J. Ex. 298; 13 Jur. 366 | 322 |
| <i>Travis v. Uttley</i> , [1894] 1 Q. B. 233; 63 L. J. M. C. 48; 70 L. T. 242; 42 W. R. 461; 58 J. P. 85 | 3 |
| <i>Tredwen v. Holman</i> , 1 H. & C. 72; 31 L. J. Ex. 398; 8 Jur. N. S. 1080; 10 W. R. 652 | 178 |
| <i>Trethowan, Re</i> , 5 Ch. D. 559; 46 L. J. Bkey. 43; 36 L. T. 70; 25 W. R. 399 | 132 |
| <i>Trower v. Chadwick</i> , 3 Bing. N. C. 334; 3 Scott 699; 2 Hodges 267 | 505 |
| <i>Trueman v. Lambert</i> , 4 M. & S. 239 | 63 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Tunnicliffe v. Birkdale, 20 Q. B. D. 450; 59 L. T. 190; 36 W. R. 360; 52 J. P. 452 | 189 |
| Turnbull v. Forman, 15 Q. B. D. 234; 54 L. J. Q. B. 489; 53 L. T. 128; 33 W. R. 768; 49 J. P. 708 | 302 |
| Turner, <i>Re</i> , 9 Q. B. 80 | 135 |
| — v. Browne, 3 C. B. 157; 15 L. J. C. P. 223; 10 Jur. 811; 4 D. & L. 201 | 551 |
| — v. Evans, 2 E. & B. 515; 22 L. J. Q. B. 412; 17 Jur. 1073; 2 De G. M. & G. 740 | 31 |
| — v. Morgan, L. R. 10 C. P. 587; 44 L. J. M. C. 161; 33 L. T. 172; 23 W. R. 659 | 331 |
| Turquand v. Bd. of Trade, 11 App. Cas. 286; 55 L. J. Q. B. 417; 55 L. T. 30 | 40, 59 |
| Turtle v. Hartwell, 6 T. R. 426 | 95 |
| Twigg's Estate, <i>Re</i> , [1892] 1 Ch. 579; 61 L. J. Ch. 444; 66 L. T. 604; 40 W. R. 297 | 353 |
| Two Hundred Chests of Tea, Smith claimant, 9 Wheaton 430 | 83 |
| Twycross v. Grant, 2 C. P. D. 469; 46 L. J. C. P. 636; 36 L. T. 812; 25 W. R. 701 | 95, 154, 356 |
| Tyerman v. Smith, 6 E. & B. 719; 25 L. J. Q. B. 359; 2 Jur. N. S. 860 | 547 |
| Tyson v. Thomas, McClel. & Y. 119 | 560, 591, 592 |

U.

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Udney v. East India Co., 13 C. B. 733; 22 L. J. C. P. 260; 17 Jur. 1078 | 207 |
| Underhill v. Ellicombe, McClel. & Y. 450 | 572 |
| — v. Longridge, 29 L. J. M. C. 65; 6 Jur. N. S. 221 | 353, 383 |
| Ungley v. Ungley, 5 Ch. D. 887; 46 L. J. Ch. 854; 37 L. T. 52; 25 W. R. 733 | 360 |
| Union Bank v. Lenanton, 3 C. P. D. 243; 47 L. J. C. P. 409; 38 L. T. 698 | 119 |
| Union S. S. Co. of New Zealand v. Melbourne Commrs., 9 App. Cas. 365; 53 L. J. P. C. 59; 50 L. T. 337; 5 Asp. M. C. 222 | 72 |
| United Alkali Co. v. Simpson, [1894] 2 Q. B. 116; 63 L. J. M. C. 141; 71 L. T. 258; 42 W. R. 509; 58 J. P. 607 | 353 |
| United Land Company v. G. E. Ry. Co., L. R. 10 Ch. 586; 44 L. J. Ch. 685; 33 L. T. 292; 23 W. R. 896 | 418 |
| United States v. Coombes, 12 Peters 80 | 369, 469 |
| — v. Fisher, 2 Cranch 386; 3 Id. 390 | 58, 112, 200 |
| — v. Gooding, 12 Wheat. 460 | 369 |
| — v. Hartwell, 6 Wall. 395 | 4, 369, 385 |

TABLE OF CASES.

CXXIX

| | PAGE |
|---|------------------|
| <i>United States v. Helen, The</i> , 6 Cranch 203 | 586 |
| — <i>v. Howard</i> , 3 Wash. 340 | 202 |
| — <i>v. Kessler</i> , Bald. 15 | 202 |
| — <i>v. Kirby</i> , 7 Wall. 482 | 135 |
| — <i>v. Klintock</i> , 5 Wheat. 144 | 202 |
| — <i>v. McLain</i> , 2 Brev. 443 (Tennessee) | 371 |
| — <i>v. Morris</i> , 14 Peters 464 | 391 |
| — <i>v. Palmer</i> , 3 Wheat. 631 | 58, 202, 446 |
| — <i>v. Thirty-six barrels of wine</i> , 7 Blatchf. 459 | 405 |
| — <i>v. Wiltberger</i> , 5 Wheat. 95 | 4, 368, 369, 370 |
| — <i>v. Winn</i> , 3 Sumner 209 | 86 |
| — <i>v. Wood</i> , 16 Peters 342 | 262 |
| <i>Unwin v. Hanson</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 115; 60 L. J. Q. B. 532; 65 L. T. 511; 39 W. R. 587; 55 J. P. 662 | 77, 78 |
| <i>Uppom v. Sumner</i> , 2 W. Bl. 1251 | 191 |
| <i>Urquhart, Re</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 723; 59 L. J. Q. B. 364; 38 W. R. 612; 7 M. B. R. 94 | 100 |

V.

| | |
|--|----------|
| <i>Vale of Neath Colliery v. Furness</i> , 45 L. J. Ch. 276; 34 L. T. 231; 24 W. R. 631 | 407 |
| <i>Valentini v. Canali</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 166; 59 L. J. Q. B. 74; 61 L. T. 731; 38 W. R. 331; 54 J. P. 295 | 293 |
| <i>Vallance v. Falle</i> , 13 Q. B. D. 109; 35 L. J. Q. B. 459; 51 L. T. 158; 32 W. R. 770; 48 J. P. 519; 5 Asp. M. C. 280 | 581 |
| <i>Vallejo v. Wheeler</i> , Cowp. 143; Lofft. 631 | 149 |
| <i>Van Sandau, Ex parte</i> , 1 De G. 303 | 527 |
| <i>Vane v. Vane</i> , L. R. 8 Ch. 383 | 121 |
| <i>Vansittart, Re</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 181; 9 M. B. R. 280; 62 L. J. Q. B. 277; 67 L. T. 592; 41 W. R. 32; 57 J. P. 132 | 99 |
| — <i>v. Taylor</i> , 4 E. & B. 910 | 298, 317 |
| <i>Vaughan v. Taff Valley R. Co.</i> , 5 H. & N. 679; 29 L. J. Ex. 247; 6 Jur. N. S. 899; 2 L. T. 394; 8 W. R. 594 | 503 |
| <i>Vaux v. Vollans</i> , 4 B. & A. 525 | 526 |
| <i>Veitch v. Exeter</i> , 8 E. & B. 986; 27 L. J. M. C. 116; 4 Jur. N. S. 584 | 168 |
| <i>Venour, Re</i> , 2 Ch. D. 525; 45 L. J. Ch. 409; 24 W. R. 752 | 59, 422 |
| <i>Verdin v. Wray</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 608; 46 L. J. Q. B. 170; 35 L. T. 942; 27 W. R. 274 | 268 |
| <i>Vernon, The</i> , 1 W. Rob. 316 | 212 |
| <i>Vernon v. St. James' Vestry</i> , 16 Ch. D. 449; 50 L. J. Ch. 81; 44 L. T. 229; 29 W. R. 222 | 505 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Vinter <i>v.</i> Hind, 10 Q. B. D. 63 ; 52 L. J. M. C. 93 ; 48 L. T. 359 ; 31 W. R. 198 ; 47 J. P. 373 | 331 |
| Violett <i>v.</i> Sympson, 27 L. J. Q. B. 138 ; 3 E. & B. 344 ; 3 Jur. N. S. 1217 | 8 |
| Virginia & Maryland S. Nav. Co., Taney and Campbell's Mary- land Rep. 418 | 488 |

W.

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Waddington <i>v.</i> London Union, 28 L. J. M. C. 113 ; E. B. & E. 370 | 284 |
| Wadham <i>v.</i> P. M. General, L. R. 6 Q. B. 644 ; 40 L. J. Q. B. 310 ; 24 L. T. 545 ; 19 W. R. 1082 | 553 |
| Wadley <i>v.</i> Baylis, 5 Taunt. 752 ; 15 R. R. 645 | 431 |
| Wadmore <i>v.</i> Dear, L. R. 7 C. P. 212 ; 41 L. J. C. P. 49 ; 26 L. T. 28 ; 20 W. R. 239 | 507 |
| Wadsworth, <i>Re</i> , 29 Ch. D. 517 ; 54 L. J. Ch. 639 ; 52 L. T. 613 ; 33 W. R. 558 | 18 |
| Wain <i>v.</i> Warlters, 5 East 10 ; 1 Smith 299 ; 7 R. R. 645 | 407 |
| Wainwright, <i>Re</i> , 1 Phil. 258 | 18, 351, 385 |
| Waite <i>v.</i> Bingley, 21 Ch. D. 674 ; 51 L. J. Ch. 651 ; 30 W. R. 698 | 205 |
| — <i>v.</i> Jones, 1 Bing. N. C. 656 ; 1 Scott 730 ; 1 Hodges 166 | 565 |
| Wake <i>v.</i> Sheffield (Mayor of), 12 Q. B. D. 142 ; 53 L. J. M. C. 1 ; 50 L. T. 76 ; 32 W. R. 82 ; 48 J. P. 197 | 266, 570 |
| Walker <i>v.</i> Clements, 15 Q. B. 1046 | 80 |
| — <i>v.</i> Crystal Palace Gas Co., [1891] 2 Q. B. 300 ; 60 L. J. Q. B. 781 ; 65 L. T. 86 ; 39 W. R. 716 | 487 |
| — <i>v.</i> Goe, 3 H. & N. 395 ; 4 H. & N. 350 ; 28 L. J. Ex. 184 ; 5 Jur. N. S. 737 | 582 |
| — <i>v.</i> Hobbs & Co., 23 Q. B. D. 458 ; 59 L. J. Q. B. 93 ; 38 W. R. 63 | 106 |
| — <i>v.</i> Horner, 1 Q. B. D. 4 ; 45 L. J. M. C. 34 ; 33 L. T. 601 | 388 |
| — <i>v.</i> Richardson, 2 M. & W. 889 ; M. & H. 251 | 70, 461 |
| Wallace <i>v.</i> Att.-Gen., L. R. 1 Ch. 1 ; 35 L. J. Ch. 124 | 206 |
| — <i>v.</i> Blackwell, 3 Drew 538 ; 25 L. J. Ch. 644 ; 2 Jur. N. S. 656 | 217, 490 |
| — <i>v.</i> King, 1 H. Bl. 13 | 356 |
| Wallgrave <i>v.</i> Tebbs, 2 K. & J. 313 ; 25 L. J. Ch. 241 | 167 |
| Walsh <i>v.</i> Southwell, 20 L. J. M. C. 165 ; 2 L. M. & P. 78 ; 6 Ex. 150 | 102 |
| Walshingham's Case, Plowd. 565 | 216 |
| Walton, <i>Ex parte</i> , 17 Ch. D. 746 ; 50 L. J. Ch. 657 ; 45 L. T. 1 ; 30 W. R. 395 | 27, 154, 362 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Wandsworth Board of Works v. United Telephone Co., 13 Q. B. D. 904; 53 L. J. Q. B. 449; 51 L. T. 148; 32 W. R. 776; 48 J. P. 676 | 129, 435 |
| Wanklyn v. Woollett, 4 C. B. 86 | 19 |
| Wanless v. N. E. Ry. Co., L. R. 7 H. L. 12; 43 L. J. Q. B. 185; 30 L. T. 275; 22 W. R. 561 | 509 |
| Wanstead Bd. v. Hill, 13 C. B. N. S. 479; 32 L. J. M. C. 135; 9 Jur. N. S. 972; 7 L. T. 744; 11 W. R. 368 | 472 |
| Warburton v. Huddersfield Industrial Soc., [1892] 1 Q. B. 817; 61 L. J. Q. B. 422; 67 L. T. 43; 40 W. R. 346; 56 J. P. 453 | 473 |
| — v. Loveland, Hads. & Br. 648 | 3 |
| Ward v. Beck, 13 C. B. N. S. 668; 32 L. J. C. P. 113; 9 Jur. N. S. 912 | 432, 524 |
| — v. Gray, 6 B. & S. 345; 34 L. J. M. C. 146; 11 Jur. N. S. 738; 12 L. T. 305; 13 W. R. 653 | 76 |
| — v. Hobbs, 3 Q. B. D. 150; 47 L. J. Q. B. 90; 37 L. T. 654; 26 W. R. 151 and 4 App. Cas. 13; 48 L. J. Q. B. 281; 40 L. T. 73; 27 W. R. 114 | 579 |
| — v. Robins, 15 M. & W. 237 | 11 |
| — v. Scott, 3 Camp. 284 | 119 |
| — v. Sec. of State for War, 32 L. J. Q. B. 53 | 108 |
| Warden v. Dean of St. Paul's, 4 Price 65 | 462 |
| — v. Tye, 2 C. P. D. 74; 46 L. J. M. C. 111; 35 L. T. 852 | 281 |
| Warkworth, The, 9 P. D. 145; 53 L. J. P. D. & A. 65; 51 L. T. 558; 33 W. R. 112; 5 Asp. M. C. 326 | 96, 412 |
| Warne v. Beresford, 2 M. & W. 848 | 305, 315, 586 |
| — v. Varley, 6 T. R. 443 | 325 |
| Warner v. Armstrong, 3 M. & K. 45 | 158, 558 |
| — v. Murdoch, 4 Ch. D. 750; 46 L. J. Ch. 121; 35 L. T. 748; 25 W. R. 207 | 314 |
| Warrington, <i>Ex parte</i> , 3 De G. M. & G. 159; 22 L. J. Bkey. 33; 17 Jur. 430 | 234 |
| — v. Furber, 8 East 242; 6 Esp. 89 | 404, 405 |
| Warwick v. White, Bunb. 106 | 184 |
| Washer v. Elliot, 1 C. P. D. 169; 45 L. J. C. P. 144; 34 L. T. 56; 24 W. R. 432 | 114 |
| Waterfall v. Penistone, 6 E. & B. 876; 26 L. J. Q. B. 100; 3 Jur. N. S. 15 | 132 |
| Waterford Peerage, The, 6 Cl. & F. 133 | 430 |
| Waterhouse v. Keen, 6 D. & R. 257; 4 B. & C. 200 | 333 |
| Waterton v. Baker, L. R. 3 Q. B. 173; 17 L. T. 468 | 543 |

| | PAGE |
|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Watkins v. Major</i> , L. R. 10 C. P. 662; 44 L. J. M. C. 164; 33 L. T. 352; 24 W. R. 164 | 139, 147 |
| <i>Watson, Re</i> , 25 Q. B. D. 27; 59 L. J. Q. B. 394; 63 L. T. 209; 38 W. R. 567; 7 M. B. R. 155 | 158, 161 |
| — <i>v. Martin</i> , 34 L. J. M. C. 50; 10 Cox C. C. 56; 11 Jur. N. S. 321; 11 L. T. 372; 13 W. R. 144 | 472 |
| <i>Watton v. Watton</i> , L. R. 1 P. 227; 35 L. J. Mat. 95; 14 L. T. 742; 15 W. R. 288 | 317 |
| <i>Watts v. Ainsworth</i> , 1 H. & C. 83; 31 L. J. Ex. 448; 6 L. T. 252 | 408 |
| <i>Waugh v. Middleton</i> , 8 Ex. 352; 22 L. J. Ex. 111 | 27, 303 |
| <i>Waymell v. Read</i> , 5 T. R. 599; 2 R. R. 675 | 559 |
| <i>Wear Nav. Co. v. Adamson</i> , 2 App. Cas. 743; 47 L. J. Q. B. 193; 37 L. T. 543 | 27, 30, 113, 134, 420 |
| <i>Weavers' Co. v. Forrest</i> , 1 Stra. 1241 | 460 |
| <i>Webb v. Bird</i> , 10 C. B. N. S. 268; 4 L. T. 445; 9 W. R. 899 and 13 C. B. N. S. 841; 31 L. J. C. P. 335; 8 Jur. N. S. 621 | 465 |
| — <i>v. Fairmanner</i> , 3 M. & W. 473; 6 D. P. C. 549 | 487 |
| — <i>v. Knight</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 530; 46 L. J. M. C. 264; 36 L. T. 791; 26 W. R. 14 | 83 |
| — <i>v. Manchester R. Co.</i> , 4 My. & C. 116 | 420 |
| <i>Webster v. Southey</i> , 36 Ch. D. 9; 56 L. J. Ch. 785; 56 L. T. 879; 35 W. R. 622; 52 J. P. 36 | 511 |
| — <i>v. Webster</i> , 27 L. J. Ch. 115 | 361 |
| <i>Weed v. Ward</i> , 40 Ch. D. 555; 58 L. J. Ch. 454; 60 L. T. 208; 37 W. R. 406 | 125 |
| <i>Weeks v. Wray</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 212; 37 L. J. Q. B. 84; 17 L. T. 498; 16 W. R. 399; 9 B. & S. 62 | 487 |
| <i>Welch v. Nash</i> , 8 East 394; 9 R. R. 478 | 287 |
| <i>Weldon v. De Bathe</i> , 14 Q. B. D. 339; 54 L. J. Q. B. 113; 53 L. T. 520; 33 W. R. 328 | 315 |
| — <i>v. Winslow</i> , 13 Q. B. D. 784; 53 L. J. Q. B. 528; 51 L. T. 643; 33 W. R. 219 | 315 |
| <i>Welford v. Beazley</i> , 3 Atk. 503 | 408 |
| <i>Wells v. London and Tilbury Ry. Co.</i> , 5 Ch. D. 126; 37 L. T. 302; 25 W. R. 325 | 400 |
| — <i>v. Porter</i> , 2 Bing. N. C. 722; 3 Scott 141; 2 Hodges 42 | 381 |
| <i>Wendon v. L. C. Co.</i> , [1894] 1 Q. B. 812; 63 L. J. M. C. 117; 70 L. T. 94 | 43 |
| <i>Wenman v. Lyon & Co.</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 192; 60 L. J. Q. B. 663; 65 L. T. 136; 39 W. R. 519 | 99 |
| <i>Werle v. Colquhoun</i> , 20 Q. B. D. 753; 57 L. J. Q. B. 323; 58 L. T. 756; 36 W. R. 613; 52 J. P. 644 | 207 |

TABLE OF CASES.

CXXXiii

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Weacombe's Case, L. R. 4 Q. B. 110; 19 L. T. N. S. 397 . . . | 90 |
| Wesson v. Alcard, 8 Ex. 260; 22 L. J. Ex. 45 . . . | 13 |
| West v. Francis, 5 B. & Ald. 737; 1 D. & R. 400 . . . | 222 |
| West Ham Ass. Cttee. v. Iles, 8 App. Cas. 386; 52 L. J. Q. B. 650; 49 L. T. 205; 31 W. R. 928; 47 J. P. 708 . . . | 71 |
| West Ham v. Fourth City Bldg. Socy., [1892] 1 Q. B. 654; 60 L. J. M. C. 128; 66 L. T. 350; 40 W. R. 446; 56 J. P. 438 | 215, 227 |
| West India Improvement Co. v. Attorney-Gen. of Jamaica, [1894] A. C. 243; 70 L. T. 80 . . . | 493 |
| Westbrook v. Blythe, 3 El. & Bl. 737; 2 C. L. R. 1660; 23 L. J. Q. B. 386; 1 Jur. N. S. 85 . . . | 249 |
| Westbury v. Coston, 2 Salk. 532 . . . | 165 |
| Western Counties Ry. Co. v. Windsor & Annapolis Ry. Co., 7 App. Cas. 178; 51 L. J. P. C. 43; 46 L. T. 351 . . . | 400 |
| Western National Bank v. Perez, [1891] 1 Q. B. 304; 60 L. J. Q. B. 272; 64 L. T. 543; 39 W. R. 245 . . . | 204 |
| Westerton v. Liddell, reported by Moore; 1 Jur. N. S. 1178 . . . | 519 |
| Westminster v. Gerrard, 2 Bulst. 346 . . . | 386 |
| Westmore v. Paine, [1891] 1 Q. B. 482; 60 L. J. M. C. 89; 64 L. T. 55; 39 W. R. 463; 55 J. P. 440; 17 Cox C. C. 244 . . . | 550 |
| Westmoreland, The, 2 W. Rob. 394 . . . | 114 |
| Westover v. Perkins, 2 E. & E. 57; 28 L. J. M. C. 227 . . . | 189, 439 |
| Wethered v. Calcutt, 5 Scott N. R. 409; 4 M. & G. 566; 6 Jur. 487 . . . | 63, 94 |
| Wetherell v. Jones, 3 B. & A. 221 . . . | 563 |
| Wetherfield v. Nelson, L. R. 4 C. P. 571; 38 L. J. C. P. 220; 20 L. T. 366; 17 W. R. 651 . . . | 414 |
| Weymouth v. Nugent, 6 B. & S. 22; 34 L. J. M. C. 81; 11 Jur. N. S. 465; 11 L. T. 672; 13 W. R. 338 . . . | 439 |
| Wheat v. Brown, [1892] 1 Q. B. 418; 61 L. J. M. C. 94; 66 L. T. 464; 40 W. R. 462; 56 J. P. 153 . . . | 377 |
| Wheaton v. Maple & Co., [1893] 3 Ch. 48; 62 L. J. Ch. 963; 69 L. T. 208; 41 W. R. 677 . . . | 192 |
| Whidborne v. Eccles. Com., 7 Ch. D. 375; 47 L. J. Ch. 129; 37 L. T. 346 . . . | 119 |
| Whinney, <i>Ex parte</i> , 13 Q. B. D. 476; 1 M. B. R. 185 . . . | 379 |
| Whistler v. Forster, 14 C. B. N. S. 248; 32 L. J. C. P. 161; 8 L. T. 317; 11 W. R. 648 . . . | 273 |
| Whitchurch v. Fulham Board, L. R. 1 Q. B. 233; 35 L. J. M. C. 145; 14 W. R. 277; 13 L. T. 631; 12 Jur. N. S. 353 . . . | 174 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| White, <i>Ex parte</i> , 33 L. J. Bkcy. 22; 10 Jur. N. S. 189; 9 L. T. 702; 12 W. R. 390 | 301 |
| — <i>v. Boot</i> , 2 T. R. 274 | 591 |
| — <i>v. Feast</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 353; 41 L. J. M. C. 81; 26 L. T. 611; 20 W. R. 382 | 138, 221, 517 |
| — <i>v. Fellowes</i> (see <i>Whitehouse v. Fellowes</i>). | |
| — <i>v. Hindley Loc. Bd.</i> , L. R. 10 Q. B. 219; 44 L. J. Q. B. 114; 32 L. T. 460; 23 W. R. 651 | 583 |
| — <i>v. Steel</i> , 12 C. B. N. S. 383; 32 L. J. C. P. 1; 5 L. T. 449 | 117 |
| — <i>v. Wright</i> , 3 B. & C. 273 | 159 |
| Whitechurch <i>v. E. London Ry. Co.</i> , L. R. 7 Ex. 424; 27 L. T. 494; 21 W. R. 28 | 23, 24, 55 |
| Whitehead <i>v. Smithers</i> , 2 C. P. D. 553; 46 L. J. M. C. 234; 37 L. T. 378 | 222 |
| Whitehorn <i>v. Thomas</i> , 7 M. & Gr. 1; 8 Scott N. R. 783; 1 Lut. Reg. Cas. 125; 14 L. J. C. P. 38; 8 Jur. 1008 | 90 |
| Whitehouse <i>v. Fellowes</i> , 10 C. B. N. S. 780; 42 L. J. Bkcy. 102; 29 L. T. 168; 21 W. R. 893 | 131, 490, 504 |
| Whiteley <i>v. Chappell</i> , L. R. 4 Q. B. 147; 38 L. J. M. C. 51; 19 L. T. 355; 17 W. R. 175 | 374 |
| — <i>v. Heaton</i> , 27 L. J. M. C. 217 | 227 |
| Whitfield <i>v. Langdale</i> , 1 Ch. D. 61; 45 L. J. Ch. 177; 33 L. T. 592; 24 W. R. 313 | 31 |
| Wigan <i>v. Fowler</i> , 1 Stark. 459; 2 Chit. 228 | 71 |
| Wigton <i>v. Snaith</i> , 16 Q. B. 496; 20 L. J. M. C. 110; 15 Jur. 246 | 319 |
| Wilberforce <i>v. Hearfield</i> , 5 Ch. D. 709; 46 L. J. Ch. 584; 25 W. R. 861 | 119 |
| Wild Ranger, <i>The</i> , 1 J. & K. 180; 9 Jur. N. S. 134; 32 L. J. Adm. 119; 11 W. R. 255; 7 L. T. 724 | 212 |
| Wiley <i>v. Crawford</i> , 1 B. & S. 253; 30 L. J. Q. B. 319; 7 Jur. N. S. 943; 4 L. T. 653; 9 W. R. 741 | 296, 452, 557 |
| Wilkes <i>v. Hungerford Market Co.</i> , 2 Bing. N. C. 281 | 582 |
| Wilkinson <i>v. Evans</i> , L. R. 1 C. P. 407; 35 L. J. C. P. 224; 12 Jur. N. S. 600; 14 W. R. 963; 1 H. & R. 552 | 409 |
| Willett <i>v. Boote</i> , 6 H. & N. 26; 30 L. J. M. C. 6; 3 L. T. 276 | 148 |
| Williams, <i>Re</i> , 2 E. & B. 84 | 266 |
| — & Stepney, <i>Re</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. 257; 60 L. J. Q. B. 636; 65 L. T. 208; 39 W. R. 533 | 310 |
| — <i>v. Burgess</i> , 12 A. & E. 635; 4 P. & D. 348; 9 D. P. C. 544 | 487 |
| — <i>v. Byrnes</i> , 1 Moo. P. C. C. N. S. 154 | 407 |
| — <i>v. Carey</i> , 4 Mod. Rep. 403; 12 Mod. 71 | 356 |
| — <i>v. Ellis</i> , 5 Q. B. D. 175; 49 L. J. M. C. 47; 42 L. T. 249; 28 W. R. 416; 44 J. P. 394 | 55, 464 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Williams v. Evans, L. R. 19 Eq. 547; 44 L. J. Ch. 319; 32 L. T. 359; 23 W. R. 466 | 18, 360 |
| — v. —, 1 Ex. D. 277; 35 L. T. 864 | 383, 395 |
| — v. Golding, L. R. 1 C. P. 69; 35 L. J. C. P. 1; 11 Jur. N. S. 51; 13 L. T. 291; 14 W. R. 60 | 470 |
| — v. G. W. R. Co., 10 Ex. 16 | 418 |
| — v. Harding, L. R. 1 H. L. 9; 12 Jur. N. S. 457 | 304, 312 |
| — v. Jones, 12 East 346; 11 R. R. 411 | 89 |
| — v. Jordan, 6 Ch. D. 517; 46 L. J. Ch. 681; 26 W. R. 230 | 407, 408 |
| — v. Lake, 2 E. & E. 349; 29 L. J. Q. B. 1; 6 Jur. N. S. 45; 1 L. T. 56 | 407, 409 |
| — v. Lear, L. R. 7 Q. B. 285; 41 L. J. M. C. 76; 25 L. T. 906 | 432 |
| — v. Lords of Admiralty, 11 C. B. 424 | 494 |
| — v. Mason, 28 L. T. 232; 21 W. R. 386 | 104 |
| — v. Pritchard, 4 T. R. 2; 2 R. R. 310 | 245 |
| — v. Roberts, 7 Exch. 618; 22 L. J. Ex. 61 | 287 |
| — v. Rose, L. R. 3 Ex. 5; 37 L. J. Ex. 12; 17 L. T. 253; 16 W. R. 316 | 278 |
| — v. Smith, 4 H. & N. 559; 28 L. J. Ex. 286; 5 Jur. N. S. 1107 | 306 |
| — v. Swansea Navigation Canal Co., L. R. 3 Ex. 158; 37 L. J. Ex. 107 | 526, 533 |
| — v. Wheeley, 8 C. B. N. S. 299 | 208 |
| Williamson v. Maggs, 28 L. J. Ex. 5 | 20 |
| Willion v. Berkeley, Plow. 236 | 187, 193 |
| Willis v. Brown, 10 Sim. 127 | 361 |
| — v. Earl Howe, [1893] 2 Ch. 545; 67 L. J. Ch. 690; 69 L. T. 358; 41 W. R. 433 | 8 |
| — v. Gipps, 5 Moo. P. C. 379 | 67 |
| — v. Thorpe, L. R. 10 Q. B. 383; 44 L. J. Q. B. 137; 33 L. T. 11; 23 W. R. 730 | 471 |
| — v. Wells, [1892] 2 Q. B. 225; 61 L. J. Q. B. 606; 67 L. T. 316; 41 W. R. 64; 56 J. P. 775 | 124 |
| Willock v. Noble, L. R. 7 H. L. 580; 44 L. J. Ch. 345; 32 L. T. 419; 23 W. R. 809 | 118 |
| Wilmot v. Rose, 3 El. & B. 563; 2 C. L. R. 677; 18 Jur. 518; 23 L. J. Q. B. 281 | 58, 63, 231 |
| Wilson, Re, 8 Ch. D. 364; 47 L. J. Bkcy. 116; 38 L. T. 730; 26 W. R. 582 | 271 |
| — v. Halifax, L. R. 3 Ex. 114; 37 L. J. Ex. 44; 17 L. T. 660; 16 W. R. 707 | 101, 325, 461 |
| — v. Knubley, 7 East 128; 3 Smith 123 | 69, 356, 359 |
| — v. Marryat, 8 T. R. 31; 1 B. & P. 430 | 85 |

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Wilson <i>v.</i> Nightingale, 8 Q. B. 1034; 10 Jur. 917; 15 L. J. Q. B. 309 | 40 |
| — <i>v.</i> Rankin, L. R. 1 Q. B. 162; 6 B. & S. 208; 11 Jur. N. S. 173; 34 L. J. Q. B. 62; 13 W. R. 404; 12 L. T. 20 and 35 L. J. Q. B. 203; 14 W. R. 198; 13 L. T. 564 | 558 |
| — <i>v.</i> Rastall, 4 T. R. 757; 2 R. R. 515 | 173 |
| — <i>v.</i> Robertson, 4 E. & B. 923; 24 L. J. Q. B. 185; 1 Jur. N. S. 755 | 168 |
| — <i>v.</i> West Hartlepool Co., 2 De G. J. & S. 475; 34 L. J. Ch. 241 | 361, 524 |
| — <i>v.</i> Wilson, 5 H. L. Cas. 40; 23 L. J. Ch. 697 | 351 |
| Wimbledon Local Board <i>v.</i> Underwood, [1892] 1 Q. B. 836; 61 L. J. Q. B. 484; 67 L. T. 55; 40 W. R. 640; 56 J. P. 633 | 128 |
| Winch <i>v.</i> Conservators of Thames, L. R. 9 C. P. 378; 43 L. J. C. P. 167; 31 L. T. 128; 22 W. R. 879 | 508 |
| Wingfield <i>v.</i> Wingfield, 9 Ch. D. 658; 47 L. J. Ch. 768; 39 L. T. 227; 26 W. R. 711 | 448 |
| Winterbottom <i>v.</i> Wright, 10 M. & W. 109 | 286 |
| Wiseman <i>v.</i> Cotton, 1 Lev. 79 | 467 |
| Withington Loc. Bd. <i>v.</i> Manchester, [1893] 2 Ch. 19; 62 L. J. Ch. 393; 68 L. T. 330; 41 W. R. 306; 57 J. P. 340 | 472 |
| Withpole's Case, Cro. Car. 134 | 456 |
| Withnell <i>v.</i> Gartham, 6 T. R. 388; 1 Esp. 323; 3 R. R. 218 | 431 |
| Wolton <i>v.</i> Gavin, 16 Q. B. 48; 20 L. J. Q. B. 73; 15 Jur. 329 | 534 |
| Wolverhampton Waterworks <i>v.</i> Hawksford, 11 C. B. N. S. 456; 31 L. J. C. P. 184; 8 Jur. N. S. 844; 6 L. T. 618 | 536 |
| Wolverton Estates, <i>Re</i> , L. R. 7 Ch. D. 197; 47 L. J. Ch. 12; 37 L. T. 573; 26 W. R. 138 | 32 |
| Wood, <i>Re</i> , L. R. 7 Ch. 302; 41 L. J. Bkcy. 21; 26 L. T. 113; 20 W. R. 403 | 457 |
| — <i>v.</i> Boosey, L. R. 2 Q. B. 340; 7 B. & S. 869; 36 L. J. Q. B. 103; 15 L. T. 530; 15 W. R. 309 and L. R. 3 Q. B. 223; 9 B. & S. 175; 37 L. J. Q. B. 84; 18 L. T. 105; 16 W. R. 485 | 522 |
| — <i>v.</i> Burgess, 24 Q. B. D. 162; 59 L. J. M. C. 13; 61 L. T. 593; 38 W. R. 331; 54 J. P. 325; 16 Cox 729 | 148 |
| — <i>v.</i> Dixie, 7 Q. B. 892; 9 Jur. 796 | 293 |
| — <i>v.</i> Heath, 4 M. & G. 918; 5 Scott N. R. 840; 2 D. N. S. 651; 12 L. J. C. P. 16 | 268 |
| — <i>v.</i> Priestner, L. R. 2 Ex. 282; 36 L. J. Ex. 127 | 31, 32 |
| — <i>v.</i> Riley, L. R. 3 C. P. 26; 37 L. J. C. P. 24; 17 L. T. 216; 16 W. R. 146 | 587 |
| — <i>v.</i> Rowcliffe, 6 Hare 191 | 123 |

TABLE OF CASES.

CXXXVII

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| Woodgate v. Godfrey, 5 Ex. D. 24; 49 L. J. Ex. 1; 42 L. T. 34; 28 W. R. 816 | 161 |
| Woodhall, <i>Ex parte</i> , 20 Q. B. D. 832; 57 L. J. M. C. 71; 59 L. T. 841; 36 W. R. 655; 52 J. P. 581 | 101 |
| Woodhouse v. Woods, 29 L. J. M. C. 149; 6 Jur. N. S. 421; 1 L. T. 59 | 526, 542, 543 |
| Woodland v. Fuller, 11 A. & E. 859; 3 P. & D. 570; 4 Jur. 743 | 489 |
| Woodward v. Lond. & N. W. R. Co., 3 Ex. D. 121; 47 L. J. Ex. 263; 38 L. T. 321; 26 W. R. 354 | 464 |
| — v. Sarsons, L. R. 10 C. P. 733; 44 L. J. C. P. 293; 32 L. T. 867 | 532 |
| — v. Watts, 2 E. & B. 452; 17 Jur. 790; 22 L. J. M. C. 149 . | 15 |
| Woolford's Trustee v. Levy, [1892] 1 Q. B. 772; 61 L. J. Q. B. 546; 66 L. T. 812; 40 W. R. 483; 56 J. P. 694 | 376 |
| Woolley v. Kay, 1 H. & N. 307; 25 L. J. Ex. 351 | 393 |
| Worcester v. Droitwich, 2 Ex. D. 49; 46 L. J. M. C. 241; 36 L. T. 186; 25 W. R. 336 | 284 |
| Worcester Banking Co. v. Firbank & Co., [1894] 1 Q. B. 784; 63 L. J. Q. B. 542; 70 L. T. 443; 42 W. R. 402 | 204 |
| Worley v. St. Mary Abbots, [1892] 2 Ch. 404; 61 L. J. Ch. 601; 66 L. T. 747; 40 W. R. 566 | 43 |
| Worms v. De Valdor, 49 L. J. Ch. 261; 41 L. T. 791; 28 W. R. 346 | 195 |
| Wray v. Ellis, 1 E. & E. 276; 28 L. J. M. C. 45 | 254 |
| Wright, <i>Re</i> , 2 K. & J. 595; 25 L. J. Ch. 621; 2 Jur. N. S. 465 . | 82 |
| —, 11 Ex. 458; 25 L. J. Ex. 49 | 205 |
| — v. Frant, 4 B. & S. 118; 32 L. J. M. C. 204; 10 Jur. N. S. 39; 8 L. T. 455; 11 W. R. 883 | 334 |
| — v. Greenroyd, 1 B. & S. 758; 31 L. J. Q. B. 4; 8 Jur. N. S. 98; 5 L. T. 347 | 309 |
| — v. Hale, 6 H. & N. 227; 30 L. J. Ex. 40; 6 Jur. N. S. 1212; 3 L. T. 444; 9 W. R. 157 | 313, 314, 316 |
| — v. Horton, 12 App. Cas. 371; 56 L. J. Ch. 873; 56 L. T. 782; 36 W. R. 17; 52 J. P. 179 | 537, 562 |
| — v. Ingle, 16 Q. B. D. 379; 55 L. J. M. C. 17; 54 L. T. 511; 34 W. R. 220; 50 J. P. 436 | 387 |
| — v. Legge, 6 Taunt. 48 | 497 |
| — v. London Omnibus Co., 2 Q. B. D. 271; 46 L. J. Q. B. 429; 36 L. T. 590; 25 W. R. 647 | 282 |
| — v. Maunder, 4 Beav. 512 | 536 |
| — v. Mills, 4 H. & N. 488; 28 L. J. Ex. 223; 5 Jur. N. S. 771 | 489 |
| — v. Monarch Invesmt. Soc., 5 Ch. D. 726; 46 L. J. Ch. 649 | 124, 181 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Wright v. Nuttall, 10 B. & C. 492 | 63 |
| — v. Pearson, L. R. 4 Q. B. 582 ; 38 L. J. Q. B. 312 ; 20 L. T. 849 ; 17 W. R. 1099 ; 10 B. & S. 723 | 484 |
| — v. Williams, 1 M. & W. 77 ; 1 Tyr. & G. 375 ; 1 Gale 410 11, 319 | 319 |
| Wrightup v. Greenacre, 10 Q. B. 1 | 242 |
| Wroughton v. Turtle, 11 M. & W. 561 ; 1 D. & L. 473 ; 13 L. J. Ex. 57 | 403 |
| Wyatt v. Barwell, 19 Ves. 439 ; 13 R. R. 236 | 362 |
| — v. Gems, [1893] 2 Q. B. 225 ; 62 L. J. M. C. 158 ; 69 L. T. 456 ; 42 W. R. 28 ; 57 J. P. 665 | 261 |
| — v. Metrop. B. of Works, 11 C. B. N. S. 744 ; 31 L. J. C. P. 217 | 497 |
| Wyndham, Doe d., v. Carew, 2 Q. B. 317 ; 1 Cr. & D. 640 ; 6 Jur. 457 | 26 |
| Wynne v. Middleton, 1 Wils. K. B. 126 | 399 |

Y.

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Yarmouth v. Simmons, 10 Ch. D. 518 ; 47 L. J. Ch. 792 ; 38 L. T. 881 ; 26 W. R. 802 | 215, 400 |
| Yates, Re, 38 Ch. D. 112 ; 57 L. J. Ch. 697 ; 59 L. T. 47 ; 36 W. R. 563 | 132 |
| — v. R., 14 Q. B. D. 648 ; 54 L. J. Q. B. 258 ; 52 L. T. 305 ; 33 W. R. 482 ; 49 J. P. 436 | 282, 456 |
| Yeadon Loc. Bd. v. Yeadon Waterworks, 41 Ch. D. 52 ; 58 L. J. Ch. 563 ; 60 L. T. 550 ; 37 W. R. 360 | 352 |
| Yearwood's Trusts, Re, 5 Ch. D. 545 ; 46 L. J. Ch. 478 ; 25 W. R. 461 | 227 |
| Yewens v. Noakes, 6 Q. B. D. 535 ; 50 L. J. Q. B. 132 ; 44 L. T. 128 ; 28 W. R. 562 ; 45 J. P. 468 | 33 |
| York's (Dean of) Case, 2 Q. B. 1 | 38 |
| York v. Middlesbrough, 2 Y. & J. 196, 214 | 64 |
| York and N. Midland R. Co. v. R., 1 El. & Bl. 858 ; 17 Jur. 690 ; 22 L. J. Q. B. 225 ; 7 Railway Cas. 459 | 7, 344 |
| Yorkshire Railway Wagon Co. v. Maclure, 21 Ch. D. 309 ; 51 L. J. Ch. 857 ; 47 L. T. 290 ; 30 W. R. 761 | 169 |
| Youle v. Mappin, 30 L. J. M. C. 234 ; 6 H. & N. 753 | 148, 259, 260 |
| Young v. Billiter, 25 L. J. Q. B. 169 ; 6 E. & B. 1 ; 2 Jur. N. S. 438 | 292, 293 |
| — v. Davis, 7 H. & N. 760 ; 31 L. J. Ex. 250 ; 8 Jur. N. S. 286 ; 6 L. T. 363 ; 10 W. R. 524 and 2 H. & C. 177 ; 8 Jur. N. S. 79 ; 9 L. T. 145 ; 11 W. R. 735 | 583 |
| — v. Edwards, 33 L. J. M. C. 227 ; 11 L. T. 424 | 417 |

TABLE OF CASES.

CXXXIX

| | PAGE |
|--|--------------------|
| Young <i>v.</i> Gratrige, L. R. 4 Q. B. 166 ; 38 L. J. M. C. 67 . . . | 477 |
| — <i>v.</i> Higgon, 6 M. & W. 49 ; 8 D. P. C. 212 | 486 |
| — <i>v.</i> Hughes, 4 H. & N. 76 ; 28 L. J. Ex. 161 ; 5 Jur. N. S. 101 ; 32 L. T. O. S. 259 | 298, 309 |
| — <i>v.</i> Leamington, 8 App. Cas. 517 ; 52 L. J. Q. B. 713 ; 49 L. T. 1 ; 31 W. R. 925 ; 47 J. P. 660 | 287, 433, 525, 539 |

Z.

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Zeta, The, [1893] App. Cas. 468 ; 53 L. J. P. 17 ; 63 L. T. 630 ; 57 J. P. 660 | 186 |
| Zollverein, The, Swab. 90 ; 2 Jur. N. S. 429 | 196, 200, 208, 213 |
| Zouche <i>v.</i> Empsey, 4 B. & A. 522 | 487 |

TABLE OF STATUTES.

| | PAGE |
|--|-------------------------|
| 9 Hen. III., Magna Charta | 48, 109 |
| 20 Hen. III., Merton | 193, 494 |
| 52 Hen. III., Marlbridge | 193, 482 |
| 3 Ed. I., Westminster 1 | 357, 425 |
| 6 Ed. I., Gloucester | 356, 358 |
| 13 Ed. I., Westminster 2 | 116, 193, 355, 357, 483 |
| circumspecte agatis | 358 |
| 21 Ed. I., de malefactoribus in parcis | 411 |
| 4 Ed. III. st. 1, c. 6, amendments | 191 |
| c. 7, trespass | 355 |
| 25 Ed. III. st. 4, c. 4, weirs | 48 |
| st. 5, c. 2, treason | 381 |
| 42 Ed. III. c. 1, confirmation of charters | 364 |
| 1 Rich. II. c. 12, prisoners | 358 |
| 6 Rich. II. c. 2, venne | 364 |
| c. 5, justices | 531 |
| 15 Rich. II. c. 3, admiralty | 426 |
| 5 Rich. II. c. 10, jail | 357 |
| 13 Rich. II. c. 7, justices | 529 |
| 2 Hen. V. c. 3, jurors | 355 |
| c. 4, justices | 531 |
| 3 Ed. IV. c. 4, imports | 564 |
| 3 Hen. VII. c. 4, fraudulent conveyance | 293 |
| 6 Hen. VIII. c. 6, procedendo | 426 |
| 21 Hen. VIII. c. 13, clergy | 135, 570 |
| 22 Hen. VIII. c. 5, bridges | 88 |
| 27 Hen. VIII. c. 10, uses | 47, 460 |
| 28 Hen. VIII. c. 11, clergy | 238 |
| 32 Hen. VIII. c. 1, wills | 118 |
| c. 23, discontinuances | 193 |
| 34 & 35 Hen. VIII. c. 5, wills | 118 |
| 38 Hen. VIII. c. 9, land | 239 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1 Ed. VI. c. 12, horse stealing | 371 |
| 5 & 6 Ed. VI. c. 1, prayer book | 427 |
| c. 16, sale of offices | 191 |
| c. 25, public-house | 381, 570 |
| 1 & 2 Ph. & M. c. 12, distress | 275 |
| 4 & 5 Ph. & M. c. 8, abduction | 64, 82, 386 |
| 1 Eliz. c. 1, supremacy | 226 |
| c. 2, recusants | 255, 427 |
| 5 Eliz. c. 4, apprentice | 292 |
| c. 5, writ | 527 |
| 13 Eliz. c. 5, fraudulent conveyance | 86, 110, 293 |
| c. 7, bankrupts | 336 |
| c. 10, ecclesiastical leases | 64, 193, 229, 242, 245, 291, 482 |
| c. 20, benefice | 169 |
| 14 Eliz. c. 11, ecclesiastical leases | 245 |
| 18 Eliz. c. 11, ecclesiastical leases | 245 |
| 23 Eliz. c. 1, recusants | 255 |
| 28 Eliz. c. 2, witchcraft | 592 |
| 31 Eliz. c. 5, penal action | 426 |
| c. 6, simony | 193 |
| c. 12, accessories | 380 |
| 39 Eliz. c. 12, hospitals | 118 |
| 43 Eliz. c. 2, poor | 54, 116, 173, 188, 220, 416, 531, 571 |
| c. 4, charitable uses | 38 |
| c. 6, costs | 241, 587 |
| c. 43, poor | 460, 568 |
| 1 Jac. I. c. 11, bigamy | 196 |
| c. 15, bankrupt | 332, 336 |
| 3 Jac. I. c. 5, recusants | 256 |
| c. 10, conveyance of felons | 67 |
| c. 12, fish | 466 |
| 7 Jac. I. c. 12, shop books | 434 |
| 21 Jac. I. c. 16, limitations | 21, 201, 241, 321, 359, 363 |
| c. 19, bankrupt | 66 |
| 16 Car. I. c. 10, petition of right | 223 |
| 12 Car. II. c. 17, clergy | 120 |
| 13 & 14 Car. II. c. 4, uniformity | 37, 428 |
| c. 12, poor | 219, 256, 334, 569 |
| 22 & 23 Car. II. c. 1, Coventry Act | 372 |
| c. 9, costs | 241 |
| c. 25, game | 466, 483 |
| 25 Car. II. c. 2, tests | 14 |
| 29 Car. II. c. 3, Statute of Frauds | 53, 208, 360, 407, 410, 462 |

TABLE OF STATUTES.

cxliii

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------------------|
| 29 Car. II. c. 7, Sunday | 295, 469 |
| 31 Car. II. c. 2, Habeas Corpus | 120 |
| 1 W. & M. c. 18, toleration | 122, 273 |
| 2 W. & M. c. 5, landlord and tenant | 231, 356 |
| c. 8, swine | 256 |
| 3 W. & M. c. 14, debt | 69 |
| 3 & 4 W. & M. c. 11, poor | 256 |
| 4 & 5 W. & M. c. 20, judgments | 20 |
| 7 & 8 Will. III. c. 25, conveyances | 125, 291 |
| 9 Will. III. c. 14, naval stores | 141 |
| c. 35, blasphemy | 256, 593 |
| 10 & 11 Will. III. c. 17, lottery | 573 |
| c. 23, larceny | 586 |
| 11 & 12 Will. III. c. 7, piracy | 135 |
| 4 Anne, c. 16, pleading | 190, 546 |
| 4 & 5 Anne, c. 16, limitations | 21, 201 |
| 5 & 6 Anne, c. 14, game | 145, 391 |
| 6 Anne, c. 16, brokers | 49, 561 |
| 7 Anne, c. 12, ambassadors | 155, 201 |
| c. 20, registration | 249, 361 |
| 8 Anne, c. 7, customs | 332 |
| c. 19, copyright | 210, 576 |
| 9 Anne, c. 10, post office | 576 |
| c. 14, gaming | 289, 448 |
| c. 20, mandamus | 36 |
| 12 Anne, st. 2, c. 16, usury | 158, 234 |
| 1 Geo. I. st. 2, c. 5, riot | 372 |
| st. 2, c. 13, Papist | 14, 441 |
| 3 Geo. I. c. 13, pilot | 13 |
| 4 Geo. I. c. 12, ships | 467 |
| 5 Geo. I. c. 8, poor | 51 |
| c. 27, artificers | 258 |
| 6 Geo. I. c. 18, Bubble Act | 49 |
| 7 Geo. I. c. 21, bottomry | 227 |
| 9 Geo. I. c. 7, appeal | 14 |
| c. 22, Black Act | 258 |
| 10 Geo. I. c. 4, Papist | 441 |
| 5 Geo. II. c. 3, bankruptcy | 48 |
| 7 Geo. II. c. 8, stock-jobbing | 380 |
| 8 Geo. II. c. 13, copyright | 110, 382, 522 |
| 9 Geo. II. c. 36, mortmain | 163, 167, 251, 300, 461 |
| 10 Geo. II. c. 31, apprentice | 555 |
| 11 Geo. II. c. 19, distress | 150, 471, 574 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------|
| 13 Geo. II. c. 18, certiorari | 190 |
| c. 28, impressment | 223 |
| 14 Geo. II. c. 6, cattle stealing | 483 |
| 17 Geo. II. c. 3, poor rate | 20 |
| c. 38, poor | 110, 220, 241 |
| 18 Geo. II. c. 20, justices | 15, 533 |
| 19 Geo. II. c. 22, harbours | 260 |
| 20 Geo. II. c. 19, apprentice | 469 |
| 23 Geo. II. c. 13, artificers | 258 |
| 24 Geo. II. c. 44, justices | 218, 238 |
| 25 Geo. II. c. 6, wills | 62 |
| 26 Geo. II. c. 6, quarantine | 569 |
| c. 14, fees at sessions. | 532 |
| 29 Geo. II. c. 29, sessions | 536 |
| c. 33, marriage | 82 |
| 32 Geo. II. c. 28, arrest | 84 |
| 2 Geo. III. c. 19, game | 322 |
| 5 Geo. III. c. 14, fish | 391 |
| 6 Geo. III. c. 19, gloves | 382 |
| c. 25, master and servant | 259 |
| 12 Geo. III. c. 11, Royal marriages | 198 |
| c. 24, destroying stores | 593 |
| c. 61, gunpowder | 466 |
| 14 Geo. III. c. 78, fire insurance | 65 |
| 16 Geo. III. c. 30, deer | 258 |
| 17 Geo. III. c. 26, annuities | 81, 467 |
| c. 38, rates | 62 |
| c. 42, bricks | 560 |
| c. 50, auction duty | 290 |
| c. 56, larceny | 478 |
| c. 57, copyright | 222 |
| 21 Geo. III. c. 70, East India Company | 279 |
| 22 Geo. III. c. 75, Colonial Offices | 67 |
| c. 83, poor relief | 110 |
| 23 Geo. III. c. 58, stamps | 404 |
| 25 Geo. III. c. 51, post-horse duties | 454 |
| 26 Geo. III. c. 41, impressment | 223 |
| c. 71, slaughter-house | 593 |
| c. 107, poor | 59 |
| 27 Geo. III. c. 44, ecclesiastical courts | 122 |
| 28 Geo. III. c. 48, apprentice | 555 |
| 33 Geo. III. c. 13, date of Acts | 59, 595 |
| c. 52, India | 195 |

| | PAGE |
|--|---------------|
| 33 Geo. III. c. 54, friendly societies | 240 |
| 34 Geo. III. c. 54, conspiracy | 440 |
| 35 Geo. III. c. 101, poor | 220, 240, 331 |
| 36 Geo. III. c. 52, legacy duty | 206 |
| c. 88, butter | 560 |
| 37 Geo. III. c. 123, oaths | 65 |
| 38 Geo. III. c. 5, land tax | 77 |
| c. 60, land tax | 77 |
| 39 Geo. III. c. 34, game | 322 |
| c. 79, printers | 561 |
| 39 & 40 Geo. III. c. 99, pawnbrokers | 558, 564 |
| 42 Geo. III. c. 38, sale of beer | 217 |
| 43 Geo. III. c. 59, bridge | 330 |
| c. 99, distress | 179 |
| c. 108, church | 246 |
| c. 116, land tax | 570 |
| c. 161, duties | 432 |
| 44 Geo. III. c. 98, conveyancer | 561 |
| 47 Geo. III. c. 68, coals | 560 |
| 48 Geo. III. c. 43, excise | 231 |
| c. 55, inhabited houses | 54 |
| c. 106, expired Acts | 596 |
| 50 Geo. III. c. 41, hawkers | 249 |
| 51 Geo. III. c. 36, justices | 533 |
| 53 Geo. III. c. 127, justices | 219 |
| c. 159, shipowner | 434 |
| 54 Geo. III. c. 68, proctor | 374 |
| c. 84, justices | 531 |
| c. 93, personation | 373 |
| c. 156, copyright | 222 |
| c. 159, harbours | 260 |
| 55 Geo. III. c. 58, excise | 381 |
| c. 137, poor | 76, 229 |
| c. 184, stamps | 237 |
| c. 194, apothecaries | 377, 554 |
| 56 Geo. III. c. 50, farm stock | 230 |
| c. 58, excise | 231, 232 |
| c. 139, apprentice | 10 |
| 57 Geo. III. c. 99, clergy | 525 |
| 59 Geo. III. c. 38, Newfoundland | 437 |
| c. 46, appeal of murder | 592 |
| c. 50, poor | 452 |
| c. 69, foreign enlistment | 33 |

| | PAGE |
|---|---------------------------|
| 1 Geo. IV. c. 117, larceny | 586 |
| 1 & 2 Geo. IV. c. 18, witchcraft | 592 |
| 3 Geo. IV. c. 39, warrant of attorney | 454 |
| c. 71, cruelty | 483 |
| c. 126, turnpikes | 247, 439 |
| 4 Geo. IV. c. 34, master and servant | 135, 147, 250 |
| c. 94, excise | 563 |
| c. 95, turnpikes | 439 |
| 5 Geo. IV. c. 14, marine forces | 339 |
| c. 83, vagrants | 50, 377 |
| c. 84, felon | 64, 530 |
| c. 113, slave trade | 33, 199 |
| 6 Geo. IV. c. 16, bankruptcy | 50, 52, 53, 196, 310, 432 |
| c. 50, false verdict | 592 |
| c. 57, settlement | 54 |
| c. 81, excise | 563 |
| c. 125, pilots | 451 |
| 7 Geo. IV. c. 46, joint-stock banks | 226 |
| c. 57, insolvents | 536 |
| 7 & 8 Geo. IV. c. 28, criminal trials | 430 |
| c. 29, false pretences | 375, 397 |
| c. 30, riot | 395 |
| c. 71, arrest | 251 |
| 9 Geo. IV. c. 14, limitation | 52, 104, 311, 450 |
| c. 23, bankers | 238 |
| c. 31, murder at sea | 201, 274 |
| c. 40, lunatic prisoner | 591 |
| c. 60, corn | 391 |
| c. 61, public-house | 226, 454, 591 |
| c. 69, game | 436 |
| c. 83, N. S. Wales | 195 |
| 10 Geo. IV. c. 56, friendly societies | 124 |
| 11 Geo. IV. & 1 Will. IV. c. 64, beer | 231, 232, 249, 381 |
| c. 68, carriers | 16, 285, 330 |
| c. 70, procedure | 193, 237 |
| 1 Will. IV. c. 22, evidence | 339 |
| 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 22, hackney carriage | 454 |
| c. 32, game | 139, 274, 381, 391 |
| c. 37, Truck Act | 104, 159 |
| c. 51, lands in Ireland | 232 |
| c. 58, interpleader | 191 |
| 2 Will. IV. c. 33, land suits | 413 |
| 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 45, reform | 47, 54 |

TABLE OF STATUTES.

cxlvii

| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 71, prescription | 11, 40, 125, 250, 464 |
| c. 100, tithes | 67, 228 |
| 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 15, dramatic copyright | 102 |
| c. 27, limitations | 121, 213, 228, 233 |
| c. 42, limitations 21, 53, 107, 213, 233, 316, 363, 468 | |
| c. 53, customs | 277 |
| c. 74, fines and recoveries | 121, 218, 351, 519 |
| c. 90, poor | 474 |
| c. 98, usury | 234 |
| c. 105, dower | 38, 41 |
| 4 & 5 Will. IV. c. 36, C. C. Court | 429 |
| c. 76, poor | 76, 230, 501, 511, 530, 552 |
| c. 82, stock | 413 |
| c. 85, public-house | 167, 537 |
| 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 23, loan societies | 181 |
| c. 41, bankrupt securities | 432 |
| c. 50, highways | 78, 144, 174, 217, 238, 265, 333, 382, 394, 454, 556, 583 |
| c. 54, prohibited degrees | 79, 198 |
| c. 63, weights and measures | 149, 197, 383 |
| c. 76, municipal corporations | 97, 103, 117, 384, 468, 479 |
| c. 83, patent | 305 |
| 6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 37, bread | 332 |
| c. 56, Scotland, process | 592 |
| c. 57, Cape of Good Hope | 195 |
| c. 71, tithes | 119, 499 |
| c. 76, newspaper stamps | 404 |
| c. 86, registration | 569 |
| c. 96, assessment | 54, 534 |
| 1 Vict. c. 26, wills | 117 |
| c. 36, post office | 391 |
| c. 45, jurisdiction | 20 |
| c. 85, injuries | 467 |
| 1 & 2 Vict. c. 26, wills | 448 |
| c. 80, special constables | 512 |
| c. 106, clergy | 238 |
| c. 110, insolvents | 49, 52, 110, 219, 229, 248, 251, 328 |
| 2 & 3 Vict. c. 11, judgments | 20 |
| c. 37, usury | 234 |
| c. 47, police | 256, 454 |
| c. 71, police | 97, 253, 467 |
| c. 73, slave trade | 208 |

| | PAGE |
|--|--------------------|
| 2 & 3 Vict. c. 84, rates | 348 |
| 3 & 4 Vict. c. 24, costs | 241, 587 |
| c. 54, lunatic prisoner | 591 |
| c. 61, beer | 174 |
| c. 65, admiralty | 315 |
| c. 85, chimneys | 236 |
| c. 86, church discipline | 340 |
| c. 97, trains | 388 |
| 4 & 5 Vict. c. 48, corporations | 440 |
| 5 Vict. c. 27, ecclesiastical leases | 242 |
| 5 & 6 Vict. c. 22, lunatic prisoner | 219 |
| c. 35, income tax | 434, 444 |
| c. 39, factors | 123, 283, 462 |
| c. 45, copyright | 99, 210, 522 |
| c. 54, tithes | 336 |
| c. 79, stamps | 404 |
| c. 93, adulteration | 141 |
| c. 95, sessions | 252 |
| 6 & 7 Vict. c. 18, registration | 53, 103, 571 |
| c. 68, plays | 160 |
| c. 73, attorney | 316, 375, 574 |
| c. 76, extradition | 94 |
| c. 86, hackney coaches | 454 |
| c. 94, jurisdiction abroad | 195 |
| c. 96, Campbell's Act | 160 |
| 7 & 8 Vict. c. 12, copyright | 522 |
| c. 15, factories | 236, 392 |
| c. 24, engrossing | 592 |
| c. 29, game | 436 |
| c. 96, insolvency | 80 |
| c. 101, poor | 12, 197, 211 |
| c. 110, companies | 347, 555 |
| 8 & 9 Vict. c. 16, companies | 153, 244, 347, 524 |
| c. 18, lands clauses | 187, 251 |
| c. 20, railways | 80, 99, 573 |
| c. 89, ship registry | 296 |
| c. 95, county court | 515 |
| c. 100, lunatics | 143 |
| c. 106, real property | 239, 247, 457 |
| c. 109, wagers | 151, 300, 557 |
| 9 & 10 Vict. c. 93, loss of life | 211, 245 |
| c. 95, county courts | 181, 220, 465 |

TABLE OF STATUTES.

cxlix

| | PAGE |
|--|------------------------------|
| 10 & 11 Vict. c. 27, harbours | 133 |
| c. 102, insolvency | 328 |
| 11 & 12 Vict. c. 21, India | 13 |
| c. 42, justices | 335, 484 |
| c. 43, justices | 221, 312, 430, 492 |
| c. 44, county court | 20 |
| c. 63, health of towns | 270, 472, 477, 527, 535, 538 |
| c. 123, nuisances | 183, 220 |
| 12 & 13 Vict. c. 45, sessions | 61, 190, 221, 241 |
| c. 92, cruelty | 280, 377 |
| c. 96, high seas | 199, 446 |
| c. 106, bankruptcy : | |
| s. 112 | 278 |
| s. 113 | 48 |
| s. 137 | 60, 293, 455 |
| s. 198 | 278 |
| s. 201 | 392 |
| s. 202 | 50, 432 |
| s. 224 | 303 |
| 13 & 14 Vict. c. 60, trustees | 416 |
| c. 61, county courts | 546, 587 |
| c. 97, stamps | 240 |
| 14 & 15 Vict. c. 28, lodging-house | 134 |
| c. 105, personation | 374 |
| 15 & 16 Vict. c. 54, county court | 587 |
| c. 76, common law procedure : | |
| s. 24 | 19 |
| s. 32 | 317 |
| s. 128 | 315 |
| c. 86, Chancery | 81 |
| 16 & 17 Vict. c. 30, vexatious indictments | 151 |
| c. 34, income tax | 207 |
| c. 41, lodging-house | 134 |
| c. 51, succession duty | 75, 206, 304 |
| c. 59, cheque | 152 |
| c. 96, lunatics | 523 |
| c. 107, customs | 208 |
| c. 119, betting-houses | 480 |
| c. 128, smoke | 144 |
| 17 & 18 Vict. c. 31, railways | 35, 327 |
| c. 36, bills of sale | 93, 131, 150, 161, 295 |
| c. 38, gaming | 253 |

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------------------|
| 17 & 18 Vict. c. 102, bribery | 393 |
| c. 104, merchant shipping : | |
| s. 2 | 100 |
| s. 50 | 296, 557 |
| s. 55 | 523 |
| s. 57 | 456 |
| s. 172 | 581 |
| s. 267 | 202 |
| s. 299 | 49 |
| s. 318 | 100 |
| s. 353 | 240 |
| s. 355 | 416 |
| s. 374 | 327 |
| s. 379 | 451 |
| s. 388 | 411 |
| s. 458 | 205 |
| s. 476 | 205 |
| ss. 502-516 | 544 |
| s. 523 | 114 |
| s. 527 | 202, 437 |
| s. 534 | 433 |
| c. 125, common law procedure : | |
| s. 32 | 317 |
| s. 50 | 17, 106 |
| s. 60 | 17, 49 |
| 18 & 19 Vict. c. 108, mines | 383 |
| c. 118, public-houses | 226 |
| c. 120, metropolis management | 183, 249, 252, 261, 513 |
| c. 121, nuisance | 104, 239, 263 |
| c. 122, metropolis building | 132, 447, 469, 519, 554 |
| c. 124, charitable trusts | 510 |
| c. 128, burial | 429 |
| 19 & 20 Vict. c. 97, mercantile law | 305, 307, 312 |
| c. 108, county courts | 246 |
| 20 Vict. c. 19, poor | 301 |
| 20 & 21 Vict. c. 3, penal servitude | 199 |
| c. 43, appeal | 191, 268, 541, 550 |
| c. 83, obscene books | 148 |
| c. 157, Mayor's court | 247 |
| 21 & 22 Vict. c. 85, divorce | 18, 198, 304 |
| c. 90, medical | 308 |
| c. 95, probate | 309 |
| c. 109, minerals | 437 |

TABLE OF STATUTES.

cli

| | PAGE |
|--|--|
| 22 & 23 Vict. c. 21, Exchequer | 414 |
| c. 56, weights | 128 |
| 23 & 24 Vict. c. 27, refreshment-houses | 62 |
| c. 28, stock jobbing | 380 |
| c. 35, property | 308 |
| c. 38, judgments | 307 |
| c. 125, metropolis gas | 253 |
| c. 126, common law procedure | 316 |
| c. 127, attorney | 17, 375 |
| 24 & 25 Vict. c. 10, admiralty | 46, 213, 244, 315, 465, 544 |
| c. 21, excise | 217, 435 |
| c. 31, Sierra Leone | 195 |
| c. 52, larceny | 470 |
| c. 61, local government | 270 |
| c. 91, stamps | 535 |
| c. 96, larceny | 126, 325, 375, 380, 391, 396, 398 |
| c. 97, mischief | 271 |
| c. 98, forgery | 267 |
| c. 100, offences against the person, 137, 201, 234, 386, 388 | |
| c. 109, weirs | 141, 453 |
| c. 114, domicile | 205 |
| c. 134, bankruptcy | 436 |
| 25 & 26 Vict. c. 35, Scotch public-houses | 176 |
| c. 61, highways | 444 |
| c. 63, merchant shipping | 95, 100, 211, 524 |
| c. 68, copyright | 45, 390 |
| c. 86, lunacy | 235 |
| c. 87, friendly societies | 588 |
| c. 89, companies | 44, 79, 153, 162, 244, 444, 475, 496, 498, 537, 556, 562 |
| c. 102, metropolis management | 42, 218, 333, 378 |
| c. 103, assessment | 528 |
| c. 114, game | 330 |
| 26 & 27 Vict. c. 29, election | 19, 326, 557 |
| c. 33, beerhouse | 382 |
| c. 35, S. Africa | 195 |
| c. 41, innkeepers | 522 |
| c. 112, telegraphs | 111 |
| c. 117, nuisance | 476 |
| c. 118, companies | 495 |
| 27 & 28 Vict. c. 55, street music | 257 |
| c. 101, highways | 51 |
| 28 & 29 Vict. c. 83, locomotive | 382 |

| | PAGE |
|---|--|
| 28 & 29 Vict. c. 86, partnership | 401 |
| c. 116, foreign jurisdiction | 195 |
| c. 126, prisons | 478 |
| 29 & 30 Vict. c. 19, Parliament | 449, 568 |
| c. 89, Thames navigation | 508 |
| 30 & 31 Vict. c. 6, asylum | 505 |
| c. 23, insurance | 155 |
| c. 84, vaccination | 288 |
| c. 102, election | 47 |
| c. 124, merchant shipping | 49, 195 |
| c. 131, companies | 99, 154, 496, 576 |
| c. 134, metropolis | 376 |
| c. 142, county courts | 53, 237, 316, 587 |
| c. 146, workshops | 236 |
| 31 & 32 Vict. c. 54, judgments | 495 |
| c. 71, county courts | 87, 185 |
| c. 89, commons | 58 |
| c. 116, larceny | 87, 380 |
| c. 121, pharmacy | 106, 447 |
| 32 & 33 Vict. c. 27, beerhouse | 175, 510, 591 |
| c. 41, assessment | 12, 62 |
| c. 46, debts | 233 |
| c. 51, county courts | 24, 185 |
| c. 55, municipal elections | 117 |
| c. 62, debtors | 10, 114, 191, 289, 294, 373, 379 |
| c. 67, metropolis valuation | 280, 540 |
| c. 70, diseases of animals | 139, 578, 583 |
| c. 71, bankruptcy | 23, 24, 76, 79, 119, 154, 163, 168, 172, 196, 324, 457, 463, 519 |
| c. 73, telegraphs | 111 |
| 33 & 34 Vict. c. 29, public-houses | 281, 310 |
| c. 35, apportionment | 300, 475 |
| c. 52, extradition | 34, 331 |
| c. 71, national debt | 125 |
| c. 75, education | 198, 289 |
| c. 90, foreign enlistment | 392, 437 |
| c. 93, married woman | 22, 116, 498 |
| c. 97, stamps | 170, 405 |
| 34 & 35 Vict. c. 8, West Africa | 195, 201, 321 |
| c. 31, trade unions | 230 |
| c. 43, ecclesiastical dilapidations | 530 |
| c. 79, lodger's goods | 522 |
| c. 98, vaccination | 385 |

TABLE OF STATUTES.

cliii

| | PAGE |
|--|-------------------------|
| 34 & 35 Vict. c. 112, habitual criminals | 22 |
| 35 & 36 Vict. c. 19, kidnapping | 195, 301 |
| c. 33, ballot | 15, 44, 510, 532, 576 |
| c. 65, bastards | 197 |
| c. 74, adulteration | 43, 450 |
| c. 77, mines | 97, 465 |
| c. 78, wild birds | 222 |
| c. 86, local courts | 130 |
| c. 94, licensing 16, 96, 143, 145, 146, 389, 415, 453, 591 | |
| 36 & 37 Vict. c. 60, extradition | 440 |
| c. 66, judicature | 114, 124, 126, 221, 223 |
| c. 76, railways | 115 |
| c. 85, shipping | 100, 279 |
| 37 & 38 Vict. c. 38, Straits Settlements | 321 |
| c. 57, limitation | 289 |
| c. 62, infants | 292, 307 |
| c. 85, public worship | 416, 527 |
| 38 & 39 Vict. c. 36, artizans' dwellings | 98 |
| c. 50, county courts | 224, 544 |
| c. 55, public health 129, 142, 282, 285, 351, 394, 435, | 444, 472, 526, 539 |
| c. 60, friendly society | 101 |
| c. 63, adulteration | 143, 390 |
| c. 77, judicature | 132, 246, 306, 488 |
| c. 86, conspiracy | 128 |
| c. 94, defilement | 235 |
| 39 & 40 Vict. c. 22, trades union | 230 |
| c. 29, wild birds | 222 |
| c. 36, customs | 208, 437 |
| c. 61, parish | 299 |
| 40 & 41 Vict. c. 39, factors | 123 |
| 41 & 42 Vict. c. 31, bills of sale | 22, 99, 160, 244 |
| c. 77, highways | 435 |
| 42 & 43 Vict. c. 49, summary jurisdiction | 252, 550 |
| 43 & 44 Vict. c. 9, time | 485 |
| c. 35, wild birds | 222 |
| c. 42, employers' liability | 40 |
| 44 & 45 Vict. c. 12, revenue | 168, 309, 403 |
| c. 41, conveyancing | 308 |
| c. 51, wild birds | 222 |
| c. 58, army | 97 |
| c. 60, newspaper libels | 282 |
| c. 61, Welsh Sunday closing | 10, 111 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------------------------------|
| 45 & 46 Vict. c. 14, metropolis | 87 |
| c. 22, boilers | 99 |
| c. 43, bills of sale . 10, 23, 91, 128, 150, 160, 161, 244, | 296, 301, 566 |
| c. 61, bills of exchange | 18 |
| c. 75, married women's property . 118, 124, 218, 246, | 302, 315, 498 |
| 46 & 47 Vict. c. 51, corrupt practices | 105, 338 |
| c. 52, bankruptcy . 23, 79, 149, 160, 203, 293, 302, 304, | 306, 344, 379, 430, 456, 465 |
| c. 57, patents | 476 |
| c. 61, agricultural holdings | 99 |
| 48 & 49 Vict. c. 3, reform | 54 |
| c. 46, voting | 99 |
| c. 69, criminal law | 195 |
| c. 72, artisans' dwellings | 106 |
| 49 & 50 Vict. c. 33, international copyright | 302, 445 |
| 50 & 51 Vict. c. 28, merchandise marks | 148 |
| c. 29, margarine | 377 |
| c. 46, truck | 159 |
| c. 55, sheriffs | 84, 127, 144, 376 |
| c. 58, coal mines | 567 |
| c. 66, bankruptcy | 279, 331 |
| 51 & 52 Vict. c. 8, revenue | 564 |
| c. 43, county courts | 20, 224, 323, 413 |
| 52 & 53 Vict. c. 7, revenue | 168, 309 |
| c. 21, weights and measures | 146 |
| c. 49, arbitration | 152, 322, 337 |
| c. 63, interpretation . 50, 59, 85, 257, 346, 485, 491, 492, | 501, 585, 588, 590, 594, 596 |
| 53 & 54 Vict. c. 29, intestacy | 353 |
| c. 44, judicature | 111 |
| c. 63, companies | 450 |
| c. 71, bankruptcy | 301, 318, 373 |
| 55 & 56 Vict. c. 9, gaming | 301, 558 |

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

- Page 8, note (b), line 21.—*Thorne v. Heard* is affirmed in [1895] A. C. 495.
- „ 38.—*For* 44 Eliz. c. 4, *read* 43 Eliz. c. 4.
- „ 39, note (b).—*For* 4 Bro. P. C., *read* 4 Bro. C. C.
- „ 39, note (d).—Add: But see [1895] A. C. 542, where the decision is reversed.
- „ 43, note (a).—Add: *Lavy v. L. C. C.*, [1895] 2 Q. B. 577.
- „ 46, line 9, add a note: In *R. v. Titterton*, [1895] 2 Q. B. at page 67, Lord Russell of Killowen, C.J., observes that “it is proper to refer to earlier Acts in *pari materia* only where there is ambiguity.”
- „ 50.—*For* 5 Geo. IV. c. 8, *read* 5 Geo. IV. c. 83.
- „ 75.—*For* 1343, *read* 1350.
- „ 77, note (b), line 2.—*For* Harrison, *read* Hanson.
- „ 78, note (b).—*For* Harrison, *read* Hanson.
- „ 83, note (a).—Add: “Grain,” *Cotton v. Vogan & Co.*, [1895] 2 Q. B. 652.
- „ 96.—After (c) in line 8 add: A driver who leaves a carriage and horses standing in the highway, leaves them while they are “passing” upon such highway within sec. 78 of the Highways Act, 1835 (5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 50); *Phythian v. Baxendale*, [1895] 1 Q. B. 768.
- „ 97.—Add to note (a): *Re Saunders*, [1895] 2 Q. B. 117, 424.
- „ 102, note (b).—*For* [1892], *read* [1893].
- „ 115, note (d).—*For* Coates, *read* Coaks.
- „ 118.—*For* 33 & 34 Hen. VIII. s. 14, *read* 34 & 35 Hen. VIII. c. 1.
- „ 118.—*For* 28 Hen. VIII. c. 1, *read* 32 Hen. VIII. c. 1.
- „ 130, note (c).—In line 12 *for* G. W. R., *read* G. N. R., and in line 16 *for* Board of Works, *read* Railway.
- „ 132.—Add to note (c): See *Re Leng*, [1895] 1 Ch. 652.
- „ 137.—Add at end of line 2: A licensed victualler who supplies liquor to a police constable whom he bona fide believes to be off duty, would not be guilty of supplying liquor to a police constable while on duty within sec. 16, sub-sec. 2, of the Licensing Act, 1872 (35 & 36 Vict. c. 94). *Sherras v. De Rutzen*, [1895] 1 Q. B. 918.
- „ 151, note (b).—Add: See also *Strachan v. Universal Stock Exchange*, [1895] 2 Q. B. 329.

- Page 193.—*For* 22 Hen. III. c. 22, *read* 52 Hen. III. c. 22.
- „ 204, note (b).—In last line but two *for* [1892], *read* [1893], and add at end *MacIver v. G. & J. Burns*, [1895] 2 Ch. 630.
- „ 206.—Add at end of note (e), on page 207: *San Paulo Ry. Co. v. Carter*, [1895] 1 Q. B. 580.
- „ 224, note (a).—*For* 1 Q. B., *read* P.
- „ 247.—*For* 39 & 40 Vict. c. 77, *read* 38 & 39 Vict. c. 77.
- „ 254.—Note (a): *Wray v. Ellis*, 1 E. & E. 276, is doubted and distinguished in *R. v. Titterton*, [1895] 2 Q. B. 61.
- „ 256.—*For* 9 & 10 Will. IV. c. 32, *read* 9 & 10 Will. IV. c. 35.
- „ 269.—Add at end of note (e): and *R. v. London J.J.*, [1895] 1 Q. B. 616.
- „ 289.—*For* 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, *read* 32 & 33 Vict. c. 62.
- „ 301.—*For* 36 & 37 Vict. c. 19, *read* 35 & 36 Vict. c. 19.
- „ 328.—*For* 11 & 12 Vict. c. 110, *read* 1 & 2 Vict. c. 110.
- „ 339.—*For* 5 Geo. IV. c. 141, *read* 5 Geo. IV. c. 14.
- „ 355, note (a).—Add: See *Re Foveaux*, [1895] 2 Ch. 501.
- „ 337, note (d).—*For* R. 2 Moo., *read* R. & R.
- „ 387, note (e).—*For* C. P., *read* C. & P.
- „ 389, note (f).—Add: and see *Platts v. Campbell*, [1895] 2 Q. B. 229.
- „ 433, note (c), line 7.—*For* 5 Ch. D., *read* L. R. 5 Ch.
- „ 440, note (a).—*For* [1893] 3 Ch. 246, *read* [1892] 3 Ch. 242.
- „ 441.—*For* 1 Geo. I. st. 2, c. 15, *read* 1 Geo. I. st. 2, c. 13.
- „ 456, note (a).—*For* 377, *read* 381.
- „ 463, note (d).—*For* 245, *read* 425.
- „ 472, note (d).—*For* [1892], *read* [1893].
- „ 473.—Add at end of note (b): but see *Anderson v. Anderson*, [1895] 1 Q. B. 749.
- „ 476, note (a).—*For* [1892], *read* [1893].
- „ 487.—In the text after (e) add: In order to satisfy the provision of the Bankruptcy Act, 1890, s. 1, which enacts that a debtor commits an act of bankruptcy if execution has been levied by seizure of his goods and the sheriff has held them for twenty-one days—it is necessary that the sheriff should hold the goods for twenty-one whole days, excluding the day of seizure. *Re North*, [1895] 2 Q. B. 264.
- „ 489, note (b).—Add: See also *Re North*, [1895] 2 Q. B. 264.
- „ 503, note (a), line 2.—*For* [1893], *read* [1892].
- „ 538, note (c), line 11.—Add: *The British Insulated Wire Co., Ltd., v. The Prescott Urban District Council*, [1895] 2 Q. B. 463.
- „ 547, note (a), at end.—*For* L. R. 8 Ch., *read* 8 Ch. D.

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF STATUTES.

CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.—INTRODUCTORY.

A STATUTE is the will of the Legislature ; and the fundamental rule of interpretation, to which all others are subordinate, is that a statute is to be expounded “according to the intent of them that made it” (a). The object of all interpretation of it is to determine what intention is conveyed, either expressly or by implication, by the language used, so far as it is necessary for determining whether the particular case or state of facts presented to the interpreter falls within it. When the intention is expressed, the task is one of verbal construction only ; but when the statute expresses no intention on a question to which it gives rise, and yet some intention must necessarily be imputed to the Legislature regarding it, the interpreter has to determine it by inference grounded

(a) 4 Inst. 330 ; *Sussex Peerage*, 11 Cl. & F. 143.

on certain legal principles. The Act, for instance, which imposes a penalty, recoverable summarily, on every tradesman, labourer and other person who carries on his worldly calling on a Sunday would give rise to a question of the former kind, when it had to be determined whether the class of persons to which the accused belonged was comprised in the prohibition. But two other questions arise out of the prohibition: is the offender indictable as well as punishable summarily? and, is the validity of a contract entered into in contravention of the Act, affected by it? On these corollaries or necessary inferences from its enactment, the Legislature, though silent, must nevertheless be held to have entertained some intention, and the interpreter is bound to determine what it was.

The subject of the interpretation of a statute seems thus to fall under two general heads: what are the principles which govern the construction of the language of an Act of Parliament; and next, what are those which guide the interpreter in gathering the intention on those incidental points on which the Legislature is necessarily presumed to have entertained one, but on which it has not expressed any.

SECTION II.—LITERAL CONSTRUCTION.

The first and most elementary rule of construction is, that it is to be assumed that the words and phrases are used in their technical meaning if they have

acquired one, and in their popular meaning if they have not, and that the phrases and sentences are to be construed according to the rules of grammar; and from this presumption it is not allowable to depart, where the language admits of no other meaning; nor, where it is susceptible of another meaning, unless adequate grounds are found, either in the history or cause of the enactment or in the context or in the consequences which would result from the literal interpretation, for concluding that that interpretation does not give the real intention of the Legislature (*a*). If there is nothing to modify, nothing to alter, nothing to qualify the language which the statute contains, it must be construed in the ordinary and natural meaning of the words and sentences (*b*).

- (*a*) *Bac. Ab. Statute* (I.) 2; 749, *per* Lord Brougham; *Attorney-Gen. v. Westminster Chambers Assoc.*, 1 Ex. D. 476, *per* L. N. b. 5, c. 12; *Warburton v. Loveland*, Huds. & Br. 648; *Jessel M.R.*; *Cull v. Austin*, L. R. 7 C. P. 234; *R. v. Castro*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 360; *Bradlaugh v. Clarke*, 8 App. Cas. 384, *per* Lord Fitzgerald; *Hornsey L. B. v. Monarch Bldg. Soc.*, 24 Q. B. D. 5, *per* Lord Esher M.R.; *Travis v. Uttley*, [1894] 1 Q. B. 233.
- (*b*) *St. John's, Hampstead v. Cotton*, 12 App. Cas. 6, *per* Lord Halsbury L.C.
- (*a*) *Bac. Ab. Statute* (I.) 2; Grot. b. 2, c. 16, ss. 2, 3; Puff. L. N. b. 5, c. 12; *Warburton v. Loveland*, Huds. & Br. 648; *Becke v. Smith*, 2 M. & W. 191; *Everett v. Wells*, 2 M. & Gr. 269; *R. v. Pease*, 4 B. & Ad. 41; *McDougal v. Paterson*, 11 C. B. 755; *Mallan v. May*, 13 M. & W. 511; *Mattison v. Hart*, 14 C. B. 385; *per* Maule J. in *Jeffreys v. Boosey*, 4 H. L. 815; *per* Lord Wensleydale in *Grey v. Pearson*, 6 H. L. 106, and *Abbott v. Middleton*, 7 H. L. 114; *R. v. Millis*, 10 Cl. & F.

When the language is not only plain but admits of but one meaning, the task of interpretation can hardly be said to arise. It is not allowable, says Vattel, to interpret what has no need of interpretation (*a*). Absoluta sententia expositore non eget (*b*). Such language best declares, without more, the intention of the lawgiver, and is decisive of it (*c*). The Legislature must be intended to mean what it has plainly expressed, and consequently there is no room for construction (*d*). It matters not, in such a case, what the consequences may be. Where, by the use of clear and unequivocal language, capable of only one meaning, anything is enacted by the Legislature, it must be enforced, even though it be absurd or mischievous (*e*). If the words go beyond what was probably the intention, effect must nevertheless be given to them (*f*). They cannot be construed, con-

(*a*) Law of N., b. 2, s. 263.

(*b*) 2 Inst. 533.

(*c*) *Per* Buller J. in *R. v. Hodnett*, 1 T. R. 96; *The Sussex Peerage*, 11 Cl. & F. 143; U. S. *v. Hartwell*, 6 Wallace, 395; U. S. *v. Wiltberger*, 5 Wheat. 95.

(*d*) *Per* Parke J. in *R. v. Banbury*, 1 A. & E. 142; *per* Cur. in *Fisher v. Blight*, 2 Cranch, 399.

(*e*) *Per* Lord Esher M.R. in *R. v. City of London Court*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 273, dissenting from the rule laid down by Jessel

M.R. in *The Alina*, 5 Ex. D. 227; *per* Lord Campbell in *R.*

v. Skeen, 28 L. J. M. C. 94;

per Jervis C.J. in *Abley v. Dale*, 11 C. B. 391; *per* Pollock C.B.

in *Miller v. Salomons*, 7 Ex. 475;

per Lord Brougham in *Gwynne v. Burnell*, 6 Bing. N. C. 559;

Re British Farmers &c. Co., 48 L. J. Ch. 56, and *Crawford v.*

Spooner, 6 Moo. 9. See *Sneed v. Com.* 6 Dana, 339 (Kentucky).

(*f*) *Notley v. Buck*, 8 B. & C. 164.

trary to their meaning, as embracing or excluding cases merely because no good reason appears why they should be excluded or embraced (*a*). However unjust, arbitrary or inconvenient the intention conveyed may be, it must receive its full effect (*b*). When once the intention is plain, it is not the province of a Court to scan its wisdom or its policy (*c*). Its duty is not to make the law reasonable, but to expound it as it stands, according to the real sense of the words (*d*).

It has been said that though vested rights are divested, and acts which were perfectly lawful when done, are subsequently made unlawful by a statute, those who have to interpret the law must give effect to it (*e*). And they are bound to do this even when they suspect (on conjectural grounds only) that the

(*a*) *Pike v. Hoare*, 2 Eden, 184, 572; *R. v. Hodnett*, 1 T. R. 100, *per* Lord Northington; *per* Cur. *per* Lord Mansfield; *R. v. Worcestershire*, 3 P. & D. 465, *per* in *Denn v. Reid*, 10 Peters, 524.

(*b*) *The Ornamental Woodwork Co. v. Brown*, 2 H. & C. 63, *per* Martin B. and Bramwell B.; *Mirehouse v. Rennell*, 1 Cl. & F. 546, *per* Parke J.; *R. v. Lord Denman*; *per* Bramwell B. in *Archer v. James*, 2 B. & S. 61; *Miller v. Salomons*, 7 Ex. 475, *per* Pollock C.B.; *Exp. Attwater*, 5 Ch. D. 30, *per* James L.J.

(*d*) *Biffin v. Yorke*, 6 Scott, 6 A. & E. 7; *Biffin v. Yorke*, 5 N. R. 234, *per* Cresswell J. See *ex. gr. Plasterers' Co. v. Parish Clerks' Co.*, 6 Ex. 630.

(*e*) *Per Lord Ellenborough* (*e*) *Midland R. Co. v. Pye*, 10 C. B. N. S. 179, *per* Erle and *R. v. Staffordshire*, 12 East, C.J.

language does not faithfully express what was the real intention of the Legislature when it passed the Act, or would have been its intention if the specific case had been proposed to it. "It may have been an oversight in the framers of the Act," says Parke, B., in one case, "but we must construe it according to its plain and obvious meaning" (a). "Our decision," says Lord Tenterden, in another (b), "may, in this particular case, operate to defeat the object of the Act; but it is better to abide by this consequence than to put upon it a construction not warranted by the words of the Act, in order to give effect to what we may suppose to have been the intention of the Legislature." "I cannot doubt," says Lord Campbell in another (c), "what the intention of the Legislature was; but that intention has not been carried into effect by the language used. . . . It is far better that we should abide by the words of a statute, than seek to reform it according to the supposed intention." "The Act," says Lord Abinger, in another (d), "has practically had a very pernicious effect not at all contemplated; but we cannot construe it according to that result."

(a) *Nixon v. Phillips*, 7 Ex. 192.

(b) *R. v. Barham*, 8 B. & C. 99; and see *per* Bayley J. in *R. v. Stoke Damerel*, 7 B & C. 569.

(c) *Coe v. Lawrence*, 1 E. & B. 516.

(d) *Atty.-Genl. v. Lockwood*, 9 M. & W. 395. See also *per* Lord Denman in *R. v. Mabe*, 3 A. & E. 531.

In short, when the words admit of but one meaning, a Court is not at liberty to speculate on the intention of the Legislature, and to construe them according to its own notions of what ought to have been enacted (*a*). Nothing could be more dangerous than to make such considerations the ground of construing an enactment that is unambiguous in itself. To depart from the meaning on account of such views, is, in truth, not to construe the Act, but to alter it (*b*). But the business of the interpreter is not to improve the statute; it is, to expound it. The question for him is not what the Legislature meant, but what its language means (*c*); what it has said it meant (*d*). To give a construction contrary to, or different from that which the words import or can possibly import, is not to interpret law, but to make it; and Judges are to remember that their office is *jus dicere*, not *jus dare* (*e*).

(*a*) *Per* Cur. in *York & N. Midland R. Co. v. R.*, 1 E. & B. 864. *Palmer v. Thatcher*, 3 Q. B. D. 353; *per* Lord Coleridge, in *Coxhead v. Mullis*, 3 C. P. D. 439.

(*b*) *Per* Lord Brougham in *Gwynne v. Burnell*, 6 Bing. N. C. 453; *per* Lord Westbury in *Exp. St. Sepulchre's*, 33 L. J. Ch. 372; *per* Grove J. in *Allkins v. Jupe*, L. R. 2 C. P. D. 375. (*d*) *Per* Mathew J. in *Rothschild v. Inland Revenue*, [1894] 2 Q. B. 143.

(*e*) Lord Bacon, *Essay on Judicature*. *Per* Pollock C.B. in *Rodrigues v. Mellaish*, 10 Ex. 116.

(*c*) *Wigram, Interp. Wills*, p. 7; *per* Cockburn C.J. in

Though this rule appears so obvious, it is so frequently appealed to that it is advisable to illustrate it by some examples to show its general scope and the limits of its application. It was repeatedly decided at law (*a*), for instance, that the statutes of limitations which enact that actions shall not be brought after the lapse of certain periods from the time when the cause of action accrued, barred actions brought after the time so limited, though the cause of action was not discovered or, practically, discoverable by the injured party when it accrued, or was even fraudulently concealed from him by the wrong-doer, until after the time limited by the Act had expired (*b*). The hardship of such decisions is obvious, but the language admitted of no other construction. So, if an Act provides that convictions shall be made within a certain period after the commission of the offence,

(*a*) Before the Judicature Act of 1873 (s. 24).

(*b*) *Short v. McCarthy*, 3 B. & Ald. 626; *Brown v. Howard*, 2 B. & B. 73; *Colvin v. Buckle*, 8 M. & W. 680; *Imperial Gas Co. v. London Gas Co.*, 10 Ex. 39; *Bonomi v. Backhouse*, 9 H. L. 503; *Smith v. Fox*, 6 Hare, 386; *Violett v. Sympson*, 27 L. J. Q. B. 138; *Hunter v. Gibbons*, 1 H. & N. 459; *Mitchell v. Darley Colliery*, 11

App. Cas. 127. As to concealed fraud, see the cases in equity collected in *Ecclesiastical Commissioners v. N. E. R. Co.*, 4 Ch. D. 845, and since the Judicature Act of 1873, *Gibbs v. Guild*, 9 Q. B. D. 59; *Willis v. Earl Howe*, [1893] 2 Ch. 545; *Thorne v. Heard*, [1894] 1 Ch. 599. See also *Kirk v. Todd*, 21 Ch. D. 484. Comp. Chap. IX, Sec. II.

a conviction made after the lapse of that period would be bad, although the prosecution had been begun within the time limited, and the case had been adjourned to a day beyond it, with the consent, or even at the instance of the defendant (*a*). So, when an Act gives to persons aggrieved by an order of justices, a certain period after the making of the order, for appealing to the Quarter Sessions, it has been held that the time runs from the day on which the order was verbally pronounced, not from the day of its service on the aggrieved person (*b*). Even when the order is made behind his back, as in the case of stopping up a road, the time runs from the same date, and not from the day on which he got notice of it (*c*), notwithstanding the manifest hardship and injustice resulting from such an enactment (*d*).

Where an Act ordained that no converted Papist should be deemed a Protestant unless he received the sacrament, took the abjuration oath, and filed certain certificates within six months from his declaring himself a Protestant, a compliance one day after that

(*a*) *R. v. Bellamy*, 1 B. & C. 193; *R. v. Huntingdonshire*, 1 500; *R. v. Tolley*, 3 East, 467; L. M. & P. 78; *Exp. Johnson*, *Pellew v. Wonford*, 9 B. & C. 3 B. & S. 947; *R. v. Barnett*, 1 135; *Farrell v. Tomlinson*, 5 Q. B. D. 558; *comp. R. v. Bro. P. C.* 438; *Adam v. The Inhabitants of Bristol*, 2 A. & E. 389; *R. v. Mainwaring*, E. B. & E. 474.

193; *R. v. Huntingdonshire*, 1 500; *R. v. Tolley*, 3 East, 467; L. M. & P. 78; *Exp. Johnson*, 3 B. & S. 947; *R. v. Barnett*, 1 135; *Farrell v. Tomlinson*, 5 Q. B. D. 558; *comp. R. v. Bro. P. C.* 438; *Adam v. The Inhabitants of Bristol*, 2 A. & E. 389; *R. v. Mainwaring*, E. B. & E. 474.

(*c*) *R. v. Staffordshire*, 3 East, 151.

(*d*) *Per Lord Ellenborough*,

(*b*) *R. v. Derbyshire*, 7 Q. B. Id. 153.

period was held too late (*a*). The Welsh Sunday Closing Act of 1881, being fixed to come into operation on the day "next appointed" for the annual licensing meeting, was by a literal construction postponed for a year later than was, in all probability, intended; but the Court refused to avert this result by any departure from the primary meaning of the words (*b*). If an Act of Parliament provides that no deed of apprenticeship shall be valid unless signed and sealed by justices of the peace, even the omission of the seal would be fatal to the validity of the instrument (*c*). So, if an Act authorises orders of commitment "in "open Court," an order not in the Court, but signed in another part of the building also open to the public, would be invalid (*d*). The Bills of Sale Act of 1878 requiring an affidavit of the due attestation as well as of the execution of the deed, the omission in the former to mention the attestation was held fatal, although the attestation clause of the deed asserted it (*e*). It would not be open to the inter-

(*a*) *Farrell v. Tomlinson*, 5 St. Peter's, 1 B. & Ad. 916; Bro. P. C. 438. See also *Mohammed v. Bareilly*, L. R. 1 Ind. App. 167. R. v. St. Paul's, 10 B. & C. 12; R. v. Staffordshire, 23 L. J. M. C. 17.

(*b*) *Richards v. McBride*, 8 Q. B. D. 119. (*d*) Debtors Act, 1869 (32 & 33 Vict. c. 62), s. 5; *Kenyon v. Eastwood*, 57 L. J. Q. B. 455.

(*c*) *R. v. Stoke Damerel*, 7 B. & C. 563. See also *R. v. Mellingham*, 2 Bott. 492; *R. v. Margram*, 5 T. R. 153; *R. v.* (*e*) *Ford v. Kettle*, 9 Q. B. D. 139. See also as to the Act of

preter, in such cases, to shut his eyes to the formalities required, because he deemed them unimportant, or because a hardship or failure of justice might be the consequence, in the particular case before him, of a neglect of any of them.

An Act which enacted that a pilot was to deliver up his license to the pilotage authorities "whenever" required to do so," would call for implicit obedience to the letter, however arbitrarily the power which it conferred might be misused, and although the withdrawal of the license would in effect amount to a dismissal of the pilot from his employment (*a*). The Prescription Act, making all easements indefeasible which were enjoyed for a number of years "next" before some suit or action wherein the claim or "matter" was brought in question, was held to leave the title to every easement inchoate only, no matter how long it had been uninterruptedly enjoyed, until a suit or action was brought, when it ripened into a complete right (*b*). The Act which provided that if the occupier assessed to a rate ceased to occupy before the rate was wholly discharged, the overseers should enter his successor in the rate book, and the outgoer should

1882 (45 & 46 Vict. cap. 43), House, 8 E. & B. 723.
s. 9, Parsons v. Brand, 25 Q. B. (b) 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 71 ;
 D. 110. *Comp. Bird v. Davey*, Wright v. Williams, 1. M. & W.
 [1891] 1 Q. B. 29. See another 77. See *Ward v. Robins*, 15
 illustration in *Re New Eberhardt* M. & W. 237 ; and *Cooper*
 Co., 43 Ch. D. 118. *v. Habbuck*, 12 C. B. N. S.

(a) *Henry v. Newcastle Trinity* 456.

not be liable for more than his due proportion, was held not to relieve him from the rest of the rate, when the premises remained unoccupied after his removal (a).

An enactment that a magistrate might on the application of the mother of a bastard, summon its putative father for its maintenance, within twelve months from its birth, would not authorise a second magistrate to issue a second summons after the expiration of the twelve months, merely because the first summons could not be served by reason of the defendant having absented himself, and could not be renewed or continued, because the justice who had issued it had died (b). And as the same enactment required the justices to hear the evidence of the mother at the hearing, and such other evidence as she might produce, and if her evidence was corroborated, to adjudge the man to be the putative father, it was held that no order could be made against the putative father when the mother was not examined, having died after the summons and before the hearing (c).

Where an Act prohibits the removal of a conviction by certiorari to the Supreme Court, that writ cannot

- (a) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 41, s. 16; 7 Q. B. 482; *R. v. Liverpool St. Werburgh v. Hutchinson*, Justices, 11 Q. B. D. 638.
 5 Ex. D. 19. See, as other (b) 7 & 8 Vict. c. 101; *R. v. illustrations, R. v. Mabe*, 3 A. Pickford, 1 B. & S. 77.
 & E. 531; *Marsden v. Savile* (c) *R. v. Armitage*, L. R. 7
 Foundry, 3 Ex. D. 203; Q. B. 773.
Simpkin v. Birmingham, L. R.

be issued (the justices having jurisdiction) even for the purpose of bringing up a case stated by justices for the opinion of the Court ; although the object of such a prohibition is to prevent convictions being quashed for technical defects, but not to exclude the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, when consulted on a substantial question which the justices themselves have raised (a). An Act which imposed a penalty on any person who piloted a ship in the Thames before he was examined and admitted a Trinity House pilot was held not to reach one who had been expelled from the Society after examination and admission (b). The Indian Insolvent Act, 11 & 12 Vict. c. 21, which required the insolvent to file a schedule of all his creditors, and provided that his discharge should be a bar to all demands, like a certificate under the bankruptcy laws in England, was held to bar a debt which had not been included in the schedule, and the creditor had consequently been deprived by the neglect or design of his debtor of the opportunity of opposing the discharge (c). So, where an Act gave an appeal to the next session, and directed that "no appeal should be proceeded upon" if it was found by the session that no reasonable notice had been given, but should be adjourned to the next session, the appellant

(a) *R. v. Chantrell*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 587.

(c) *Exp. Parbury*, 3 De G. F. & J. 80; comp. *Wesson v. Alcard*,

(b) *Pierce v. Hopper*, 1 Stra. 8 Ex. 260.
249.

was enabled to secure delay by omitting to give any notice, so that the session could not find that "reasonable notice" had been given (*a*). In these two cases the construction worked an injustice and enabled a person to take advantage of his own wrong or neglect (*b*); but the language of the Legislature admitted of no other construction.

The Act which required members of Parliament, before voting in the House, to take the abjuration oath in a form which concluded with the declaration that it was taken "on the true faith of a Christian," received a literal construction, which had the effect of excluding Jews from Parliament; although the history of the enactment showed that it was intended to test the loyalty, not the religious creed, of the member, and was directed solely to the exclusion of Roman Catholics; and though those who refused to take the oath would have been deemed Popish recusants, and liable to banishment as such (*c*). So the plain language of the Test and Corporation Acts of Charles II., though the first of them was really aimed only at the actual holders of offices, and the second at Roman Catholics, had the effect of disqualifying Protestant Dissenters from public employment. Where an Act disqualified from killing game all persons not

(*a*) 9 Geo. I. c. 7; *R. v. Bucks*, 3 East, 342; *R. v. Staffordshire*, 7 East, 549. See *R. v. Sussex*, 4 B. & S. 966.

(*b*) See Chap. VIII, Sec. III.

(*c*) 1 Geo. I. st. 2, c. 13; *Miller v. Salomons*, 7 Ex. 475 8 Ex. 778.

possessing land of a certain value, except the heir apparent of an esquire or other person of higher degree, it was held that esquires not possessed of the requisite property qualification were not excepted. However strange it might seem that the Legislature should refuse them the privilege which it had granted to their eldest sons (*a*), it was held to be safer to adopt what the Legislature had actually said rather than to conjecture what they had meant to say (*b*). So, under an Act which qualified for the magistracy owners in immediate remainder or reversion of lands leased for two or three lives, it was held that a remainderman expectant on the death of a tenant for life in possession was not qualified, as there was no lease. There was perhaps no good reason why the qualification should not have been extended to such a remainderman, but there was no actual absurdity, inconvenience, or injustice in the omission (*c*). The rule in the Ballot Act, which provides that a candidate may undertake any duties which any agent of his, if appointed, might have performed, and may assist his agent in the performance of such duties, and "may be present at any place at which his agent may, "in pursuance of the Act, attend," was construed literally as authorising the presence of the candidate absolutely, and not only in the event of his undertaking the duties of his agent or assisting him; though

(*a*) *Jones v. Smart*, 1 T. R. 44.

(*c*) 18 Geo. II. c. 20; *Wood-*

(*b*) *Per Ashurst J.*, *Id.* 51.

ward v. Watts, 2 E. & B. 452.

it was conceded that this construction gave a barren and useless, or even mischievous right, against which the other provisions of the Act seemed to militate (*a*).

A statute which empowered a Court of Requests to summon any person residing in a town or navigating from its port, by leaving the summons at his abode, and to proceed *ex parte* if he did not appear, was held to justify *ex parte* proceedings against a seafaring man who had for months before the summons, and during the whole of the proceeding, been absent beyond the seas (*b*). So, where an Act authorised justices to hear bastardy cases on proof that the summons had been served at the last place of abode of the putative father, it was held that they had jurisdiction in a case where the latter was abroad, and had had no cognizance of the summons (*c*). The Carriers Act, which exempted a common carrier from liability for the loss of or injury to certain classes of goods unless the value was declared and insured, was construed literally as exempting him from liability, even when the loss was owing to his negligence (*d*). The provisions of s. 8 of the Licensing Act, 1872, which require intoxicating liquors, sold by retail not

(*a*) *Clementson v. Mason*, L. 22 L.J. M.C. 143; *R. v. Higham*, R. 10 C. P. 209; see *per Brett* 7 E. & B. 557. *Comp. R. v. Smith*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 604.
J., Id. 217.

(*b*) *Culverson v. Melton*, 12 (*d*) *Hinton v. Dibbin*, 2 Q. B. A. & E. 753. 646; *Morritt v. N. E. R. Co.*, 1

(*c*) *R. v. Damarell*, L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 302.
Q. B. 50. See also *R. v. Davis*,

in cask or bottle or in quantities less than half a pint, to be sold in measures marked according to the imperial standard, would be violated by the sale of beer, even at the request of the customer, in a vessel containing one-third of a quart, there being no imperial measure answering to that quantity (*a*). The Common Law Procedure Act of 1854, which empowered a judge to order either party to a cause to produce documents, upon the application of the other party supported by his own affidavit, was held not to authorise an order on the affidavit of another person in its stead (*b*). And the same Act, in empowering a judgment creditor to obtain an order for the examination of his debtor, was held not to authorise the examination of the directors when the debtor was a corporate body (*c*). So, the Solicitors Act, 23 & 24 Vict. c. 127, s. 28, which authorises the imposition of a charge for costs on property recovered or preserved through the instrumentality of a solicitor, was held not to authorise such a charge, where the suit was to prevent or stop an invasion of the right to light; for this was a suit not respecting property, but respecting an easement merely, or the mode in which it was enjoyed (*d*); nor to a case where proceedings had not

(*a*) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94; *Payne* N. S. 761.

v. Thomas, 60 L. J. M. C. 3.

(*c*) *Dickson v. Neath and*

(*b*) *Christopherson v. Lotings*,

Brecon R. Co., L. R. 4 Ex. 87.

15 C. B. N. S. 809; comp. *Kings-*

(*d*) *Foxon v. Gascoigne*, L.

ford v. G. W. R. Co., 16 C. B.

R. 9 Ch. 654.

gone beyond a decree for an account, and the parties had then compromised without the knowledge of the solicitor of the party who thereby did recover property (*a*). A direction on his death-bed by the holder of a promissory note that it should be destroyed as soon as found, was held not "an absolute and unconditional renunciation of his rights" on the note within the Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, s. 62 (*b*).

It is but a corollary to the general rule in question, that nothing is to be added to or to be taken from a statute, unless there are similar adequate grounds to justify the inference that the Legislature intended something which it omitted to express (*c*). A case which has been omitted is not to be supplied merely because there seems no good reason why it should have been omitted, and the omission appears consequently to have been unintentional. Thus, the Divorce Act, which provided that any order made for the protection

(*a*) *Pinkerton v. Easton*, L. R. 277; *per* Lord Eldon in *Davis v. Marlborough*, 1 Swanst. 74; 16 Eq. 490. *Comp. Moxon v. Sheppard*, 24 Q. B. D. 627, where money had been paid into Court. And see *Re Wadsworth*, 29 Ch. D. 517.

(*b*) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 61; *Re George*, 44 Ch. D. 627.

(*c*) See *per* Tindal C.J. in *Everett v. Wells*, 2 M. & Gr.

277; *per* Lord Eldon in *Davis v. Marlborough*, 1 Swanst. 74; *per* Lord Westbury in *Exp. St. Sepulchre*, 33 L. J. Ch. 375; *Re Cherry's Estate*, 31 L. J. Ch. 351. *Comp. Re Wainwright, Williams v. Evans*, and other cases mentioned *infra*, Chap. IX, Sec. I.

of the earnings of a deserted married woman might be discharged by the magistrate who made it, was held not to empower his successor to discharge it, though the magistrate who had made it was dead (*a*). An Act which authorises the removal of lunatics to a hospital when there is no lunatic asylum established in the county, does not authorise such a removal when a county asylum exists, but is so full as to be unable to receive another lunatic (*b*). If an Act requires that a writ, on renewal, shall be sealed with a seal denoting the date of renewal, a copy of the writ cannot be substituted for the original for this purpose, when the original is lost (*c*). So, also, it was held that the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 29, which enacts that answers made to an election commission shall not be admitted in evidence in any proceeding except in cases of "indictment" for perjury, left them excluded in "informations" for perjury filed by the Attorney-General (*d*). Similarly, an Act requiring notice of action for "anything done" by a person in the execution of his office, does not extend to actions for words spoken in the

(*a*) 21 & 22 Vict. c. 85;
Exp. Sharpe, 5 B. & S. 322.
See also *Nettleton v. Burrell*,
8 Scott, N. R. 738; *Wanklyn*
v. Woollett, 4 C. B. 86; *R. v.*
Ashburton, 8 Q. B. 871; *Higgs*
v. Schroeder, 3 C. P. D. 252;
Newton v. Boodle, 3 C. B. 795;
Nind v. Arthur, 7 D. & L. 252.

(*b*) *R. v. Ellis*, 6 Q. B. 501.

(*c*) 15 & 16 Vict. c. 76, and
Ord. 8, Judic. Act; *Davis v.*
Garland, 1 Q. B. D. 250; and see
Nazer v. Wade, 1 B. & S. 728;
Evans v. Jones, 2 Id. 61; *Free-*
man v. Tranah, 12 C. B. 406.

(*d*) *R. v. Slator*, 8 Q. B. D.
267.

execution of it (*a*); and the provisions of the County Courts Act, 1888, which require certain formalities to be gone through before bringing an action against the bailiff, do not extend to a motion by a trustee in bankruptcy for the delivery up by the bailiff of property seized (*b*).

When the Common Law Procedure Act of 1852 abolished the writ of *distringas* without providing for the service of a writ on lunatics in confinement and inaccessible, it was found that no actions could be prosecuted against them (*c*). So, when extra-parochial places were made rateable, without either repealing the enactments which required that a copy should be affixed on or near the doors of all the churches in the parish, or making any other provision for publication, it was held, where there was no church in the extra-parochial place, that a rate affixed on a church door fifty yards from the boundary was not valid for want of publication (*d*). The 4 & 5 W. & M. c. 20, which required that judgments should be docketed, enacted that undocketed judgments should not affect lands as regarded purchasers or mortgagees, or have preference against heirs or executors. The 2 & 3 Vict. c. 11

(*a*) 11 & 12 Vict. c. 44, s. 9; C. B. 293; *Williamson v. Royal Aquarium v. Parkinson*, Maggs, 28 L. J. Ex. 5. See [1892] 1 Q. B. 431. Judic. Act, 1875, Ord. 9 (5).

(*b*) 51 & 52 Vict. c. 43, s. (*d*) 17 Geo. II. c. 3; and 1 54; *Re Locke*, 63 L. T. 320. Vict. c. 45; *R. v. Dyott*, 9

(*c*) *Holmes v. Service*, 15 Q. B. D. 47.

abolished docketing, and enacted that no judgment should have effect unless registered; but it made no provision for the protection of heirs and executors. Though this was perhaps an oversight, resulting in hardship on an executor who had paid simple contract debts without keeping sufficient assets to meet an unregistered judgment of which he had no notice, the Court refused to supply the omission (a). These were all *casus omisi* which the Court could not reach by any recognised canons of interpretation.

Where an Act authorised the apportionment of the cost of making a sewer, without limiting any time for the purpose, the Court refused to read the Act as limiting the exercise of the power to a reasonable time (b). The 21 Jac. I. having provided that the Statute of Limitations should not run while the plaintiff was beyond the seas, and the 4 & 5 Anne having made a similar provision where the defendant was abroad, the 3 & 4 W. IV. c. 42 enacted that no part of the United Kingdom should be deemed beyond the seas within the meaning of the former Act, but made no mention of the latter; and it was held that it could not be stretched to include it (c). There may have been no good reason for thus limiting the new enactment to the Act of James; but there was no sufficient

(a) *Fuller v. Redman*, 26 Beav. 600.

(b) *Bradley v. Greenwich Board*, 3 Q. B. D. 384.

(c) *Lane v. Bennett*, 1 M. & W. 70; *Battersby v. Kirk*, 2 Bing. N. C. 584.

ground either in the context or in the nature of the consequences resulting from the omission, for concluding that the Act of Anne was intended to be included. So when the Married Women's Property Act of 1870 empowered a married woman to sue, without making her liable to be sued, it was held that no action lay against her (*a*). The Habitual Criminals Act, in enacting that upon a trial for receiving stolen goods, a previous conviction for any offence involving dishonesty should be admissible against the prisoner as evidence of his having received with guilty knowledge, provided that notice were given to him that the conviction would be put in evidence "and that he would "be deemed to have known that the goods were stolen "until he proved the contrary," omitted, however, to enact substantively that this effect should be given to the conviction; and it was held that the omission could not be supplied (*b*). Without such an emendation, the notice was incorrect and misleading; but it did not lead to any injustice or inconvenience or other mischievous consequence. Although the Bills of Sale Act of 1878 required that the execution of every bill of sale should be attested by a solicitor, and that "the attestation should state" that the instrument was explained by the solicitor to the grantor before execution, it was held that no explanation was

(*a*) 33 & 34 Vict. c. 93, s. 11; *Hancock v. Lablache*, 3 C. P. D. 197. (*b*) *R. v. Davis*, 1 C. C. R. 272.

required ; for the Act did not expressly enact that an explanation should be given ; it required only that the attestation should assert that it had been given (a). So, although the Bankruptcy Act of 1869 provided for securing for the general body of creditors the proceeds of goods of a debtor sold in execution, it made no express provision for dealing with his goods when seized under an *elegit* ; and it was held that the omission, however fatal to the whole policy of the Act, could not be supplied by any stretch of judicial interpretation (b).

Where a railway Act provided that the company, while in possession, under the Act, of lands liable to assessment to parochial rates, should, until its works were completed and liable to assessment, be bound to make good the deficiency in the parochial assessment by reason of the land having been taken, it was held, at first, that the company was bound to make good the deficiency in any one of the parishes through which the line ran, only until the line was completed within the parish (c) ; but this construction was rejected by the Queen's Bench and by the Exchequer Chamber, partly on the ground that in effect it in-

(a) Repealed by 45 & 46 Vict. c. 43, s. 10 ; Exp. National Merc. Bank, 15 Ch. D. 447. Cured by 46 & 47 Vict. c. 52, s. 146. See also *Re Hutchinson*, 16 Q. B. D. 521.
 43. See also Exp. Bolland, 21 Ch. D. 542.

(c) *Whitechurch v. East London Co.*, L. R. 7 Ex. 248.

(b) Exp. Abbott, 15 Ch. D.

troduced the words "in the parish" into the Act; and it was held that the company continued liable to make good the deficiency in every parish until the whole line was completed from end to end (*a*). So the 49th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, which enacts that "an order of discharge shall not release the bankrupt from any debt or liability incurred by means of any fraud or breach of trust," is not to be confined to a fraud or breach of trust committed by the bankrupt personally; for such a construction can only be put upon the words either by reading "his" instead of "any" before the words "fraud or breach of trust," or by adding the words "committed by him" after them (*b*).

A construction which would leave without effect any part of the language, would be rejected, unless justified on similar grounds (*c*). Thus, where an Act plainly gave an appeal from one Quarter Sessions to another, it was observed that such a provision, though extraordinary and perhaps an oversight, could not be eliminated (*d*). The 32 & 33 Vict. c. 51, which gives to certain County Courts power to try claims under £300, arising out of "any agreement in relation to the

(*a*) *R. v. Metrop. Distr. R. Co.*, L. R. 6 Q. B. 698; *Whitechurch v. Fast London R. Co.*, L. R. 7 Ex. 248; reversed, however, 7 H. L. 89.

Cooper v. Pritchard, 11 Q. B. D. 351.

(*c*) See Chap. IX, Sec. I.

(*d*) *R. v. West Riding*, 1 Q. B. 329.

(*b*) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 51;

(*b*) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71;

“use or hire of a ship,” or in relation to the carriage of goods, with an appeal to the Court of Admiralty, and power to the latter Court to transfer any such causes to itself, was at first held not to give the County Court jurisdiction over suits for the breach of a charter-party, notwithstanding the comprehensive nature of the language used ; on the ground that the literal construction would involve the presumed unintended anomalies of giving by mere implication a large, novel, and inconvenient jurisdiction to the Court of Admiralty, and to the suitor the remedy of proceeding *in rem* when his claim was under £300, which he did not possess when it exceeded it (*a*). But this construction did not prevail, because it left without effect the words which gave jurisdiction over any agreement in relation to the use or hire of a ship (*b*) ; and yet it was difficult to believe that the resulting consequences were within the contemplation of the Legislature or the scope of the enactment.

In a case where the technical language used was precise and unambiguous, but incapable of reasonable meaning, the Court held that it was not at liberty, on merely conjectural grounds (*c*), to give the words a meaning which did not belong to them. The Act had

(*a*) *Simpson v. Blues*, L. R. P. C. 134 ; *The Alina*, 5 Ex. D. 7 C. P. 290 ; *Gunnestad v. Price*, 227. And see cases in note at L. R. 10 Ex. 65. end of Chap. V, Sec. I.

(*b*) *Gaudet v. Brown*, L. R. 5 (*c*) But see Chap. IX, Sec. I.

made warrants of attorney to confess judgment void as against the assignees of a bankrupt, if not filed within twenty-one days from execution, or unless judgment was signed "or" execution was "issued" within the same period; and the Court of Queen's Bench refused to alter "or" into "and," and "issued" into "levied"; though the passage was unmeaning as it stood, and the proposed alterations would have given it an effect which, because rational, was probably, but only conjecturally, the effect intended by the Legislature (*a*). This subject, however, will be further considered in a future chapter (*b*).

SECTION III.—THE CONTEXT—EXTERNAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

The foregoing elementary rule of construction does not carry the interpreter far; for it is confined to cases where the language is precise and capable of but one construction, or where neither the history or cause of the enactment, nor the context, nor the consequences to which the literal interpretation would lead, show that that interpretation does not express the real intention.

But it is another elementary rule, that a thing which is within the letter of a statute is not within the statute unless it be also within the real intention of the Legis-

(*a*) *Green v. Wood*, 7 Q. B. 178; see also *Doe v. Carew*, 2 Q. B. 317; and *Mundy v. Rut-* land, 23 Ch. D. 81. *Comp. Doe v. Moffatt*, 15 Q. B. 257.
(*b*) Chap. IX.

lature (a), and the words, if sufficiently flexible, must be construed in the sense which, if less correct grammatically, is more in harmony with that intention (b). Language is rarely so free from ambiguity as to be incapable of being used in more than one sense ; and to adhere rigidly to its literal and primary meaning in all cases would be to miss its real meaning in many. If a literal meaning had been given to the laws which forbade a layman to "lay hands" on a priest, and punished all who drew blood in the street, the layman who wounded a priest with a weapon would not have fallen within the prohibition, and the surgeon who bled a person in the street to save his life, would have been liable to punishment (c). On a literal construction of his promise, Mahomed II.'s sawing the Venetian governor's body in two, was no breach of his engagement to spare his head ; nor Tamerlane's burying alive a garrison, a violation of his pledge to shed no blood (d). On a literal construction, Paches, after inducing the defender of Notium to a parley under a

(a) Bac. Ab. Statute (I.) 5.

(b) See *per Cur.* in *Hollingworth v. Palmer*, 4 Ex. 281 ; *Waugh v. Middleton*, 8 Ex. 352, *per Pollock C.B.* ; *Caledonian R. Co. v. N. Brit. R. Co.*, L. R. 6 App. 122, *per Lord Selborne* ; *per Lord Blackburn*, in *Edinburgh Tramways Co. v. Torbain*, 3 App. 68 ; *River Wear Com.*

v. Adamson, 2 App. 743, and *Direct U.S. Cable Co. v. Anglo-American Telegraph Co.*, Id. 412 ; *per Jessel M.R.* in *Exp. Walton*, 17 Ch. D. 746.

(c) 1 Bl. Comm. 61 ; Puff. L. 5, c. 12, s. 8.

(d) Vattel, L. N. b. 2, s. 273.

promise to replace him safely in the citadel, claimed to be within his engagement when he detained his foe until the place was captured, and put him to death after having conducted him back to it (*a*); and the Earl of Argyll fulfilled in the same spirit his promise to the laird of Glenstane, that if he would surrender he would see him safe to England; for he did not hang him until after he had taken him safely across the Tweed to the English bank (*b*).

The equivocation or ambiguity of words and phrases, and especially such as are general, is said by Lord Bacon to be the great sophism of sophisms (*c*). They have frequently more than one equally obvious and popular meaning; words used in reference to one subject or set of circumstances may convey a meaning quite different from what the same words used in reference to another set of circumstances and another object would convey. General words admit of indefinite extension or restriction, according to the subject to which they relate, and the scope and object in contemplation. They may convey faithfully enough all that was intended, and yet comprise also much that was not; or, be so restricted in meaning as not

(*a*) Thucyd. 3, 34; Grote's Greece, vol. 6, c. 50.

(*b*) Burton's Sc. Crim. Tr. 17. *Immaturæ puellæ, quia more tradito nefas esset virgines strangulari, vitiatæ prius a carnifice, dein strangulatæ.* Suet. Ti-

berius, s. 61. See other instances of such frauds collected in Grot. de jure b., b. 2, c. 16, s. 5. See also Herodotus, iv. 154.

(*c*) Lord Bacon, Adv. of Learning, b. 2.

to reach all the cases which fall within the real intention. Even, therefore, where there is no indistinctness or conflict of thought, or carelessness of expression in a statute, there is enough in the vagueness and elasticity inherent in language to account for the difficulty so frequently found in ascertaining the meaning of an enactment, with the degree of accuracy necessary for determining whether a particular case falls within it. But statutes are not always drawn by skilled hands, and they are always exposed to the risk of alterations by many hands which introduce different styles and consequent difficulties of interpretation. Nothing, it has been said by a great authority, is so difficult as to construct properly an Act of Parliament; and nothing so easy as to pull it to pieces (*a*). It is not enough to attain to a degree of precision which a person reading in good faith can understand, it is necessary to obtain a degree of precision which a person reading in bad faith cannot misunderstand (*b*).

The literal construction then, has, in general, but *primâ facie* preference. To arrive at the real meaning, it is always necessary to get an exact conception of the aim, scope, and object of the whole Act; to consider, according to Lord Coke (*c*), 1. What was the

(*a*) *Per* Lord St. Leonards in *O'Flaherty v. McDowell*, 6 H.L. 179; and see also *per* Bramwell L.J. in 2 Q. B. D. 552, 2 C. P. D. 496; 4 Q. B. D. 115.

(*b*) *Per* Stephen J. in *Re Castioni*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 149.

(*c*) *Heydon's Case*, 3 Rep. 7b; 10 Rep. 73a.

law before the Act was passed ; 2. What was the mischief or defect for which the law had not provided ; 3. What remedy Parliament has appointed ; and 4. The reason of the remedy. According to another authority, the true meaning is to be found, not merely from the words of the Act, but from the cause and necessity of its being made, which are to be ascertained not only from a comparison of its several parts, but also from extraneous circumstances (*a*). The true meaning of any passage, it is said, is to be found not merely in the words of that passage, but in comparing it with every other part of the law, ascertaining also what were the circumstances with reference to which the words were used, and what was the object appearing from those circumstances, which the Legislature had in view (*b*).

As regards the history, or external circumstances which led to the enactment, the general rule which is applicable to the construction of all other documents is equally applicable to statutes (*c*), viz., that the

(*a*) *Per* Turner L.J. in *Hawkins v. Gathercole*, 6 De G. M. & G. 1, citing *Stradling v. Morgan*, Plow. 204 ; and *Eyston v. Studd*, Id. 465.

(*b*) See *per* Lord Blackburn in *Wear Navig. Com. v. Adamson*, 2 App. 743.

(*c*) It has indeed been said that it is safer to abstain from imposing with regard to Acts of Parliament any further canons of construction than those applicable to all documents. *Per* Bowen L.J. in *Lamplugh v. Norton*, 22 Q. B. D. 452.

interpreter should so far put himself in the position of those whose words he is interpreting, as to be able to see what those words relate to. Extrinsic evidence of the circumstances or surrounding facts under which a will or contract was made, so far as they throw light on the matter to which the document relates, and of the condition and position and course of dealing of the persons who made it or are mentioned in it, is always admitted as indispensable for the purpose not only of identifying such persons and things, but also of explaining the language, whenever it is latently ambiguous or susceptible of various meanings or shades of meaning, and of applying it sensibly to the circumstances to which it relates (*a*). Thus, when a charter-party stipulates that "detention by ice" is not to be reckoned among laying days, the meaning intended by this term cannot be accurately determined without that knowledge of the circumstances of the port and trade which the parties possessed, or are conclusively presumed to have possessed; and evidence of these circumstances is received for the purpose of accurately

- (*a*) Wigram Int. Wills, Prop. Turner *v.* Evans, 2 E. & B. 5; Anstee *v.* Nelms, 1 H. & N. 512; Graves *v.* Legg, 9 Ex. 225, *per* Bramwell B.; Wood 709; Lewis *v.* G. W. R. Co., 3 *v.* Priestner, L. R. 2 Ex. 70; Q. B. D. 202, *per* Bramwell Shortrede *v.* Cheek, 1 A. & E. L.J.; *Re* De Rosaz, 2 P. D. 57; Baumann *v.* James, L. R. 66; Whitfield *v.* Langdale, 1 3 Ch. 508; Doe *v.* Benyon, 12 Ch. D. 61; Hill *v.* Crook, L. R. A. & E. 431; Blundell *v.* Gladstone, 3 Mc. N. & G. 692; 6 H. L. 283.

construing the contract (*a*). When a vessel is warranted seaworthy, the meaning must vary with the nature, not only of the vessel but of the voyage; and evidence of these circumstances is admitted in order to ascertain the precise intention of the parties. In a lease of a house with a covenant to keep it in tenantable repair, it is necessary to ascertain whether the house is an old or a new one, whether it is a tenement in St. Giles's, or a palace in Grosvenor Square; for that which would be a repair of the one, might not be so of the other. So, on the sale of a horse warranted to go well in harness, the qualities of a good goer would be different in one fit to draw a lady's carriage, and a dray-horse; and it would therefore be necessary to inquire what was the kind of horse which was the subject of the warranty (*b*). Where a guarantee is worded in language equally applicable to a past and to a future credit, evidence of the state of the dealings of the parties at the time, would be necessary in order to determine which was the real sense in which they used the words (*c*).

So, in the interpretation of statutes, the interpreter, in order to understand the subject matter and the

(*a*) *Hudson v. Ede*, L R. 3 Q. B. 412; and see *Behn v. Burness*, 3 B. & S. 751.

(*b*) See the judgment of Blackburn J. in *Burgess v. Wickham*, 3 B. & S. 698; *Clapham v. Langton*, 5 B. & S. 729.

(*c*) *Goldshede v. Swan*, 1 Ex. 154; *Wood v. Priestner*, L. R. 2 Ex. 66. See other examples in *Larker v. Hordern*, 1 Ch. D. 644; *Re Wolverton Estates*, 7 Ch. D. 197; *Charter v. Charter*, L. R. 7 H. L. 364.

scope and object of the enactment, must, in Coke's words, ascertain what was the mischief or defect for which the law had not provided; that is, he must call to his aid all those external or historical facts which are necessary for this purpose, and which led to the enactment (*a*), and for these he may consult contemporary or other authentic works and writings (*b*). In his celebrated judgment in the Alabama arbitration, Cockburn, C.J., showed, by a reference to their history, that both the American and English Foreign Enlistment Acts of the early part of the present century were intended, not to prevent the sale of armed ships to belligerents, but to prevent American and English citizens from manning privateers against belligerents (*c*). The 5 Geo. IV. c. 113, for the abolition of the slave trade, was construed to extend to offences committed by British subjects out of the British dominions, that is, on the West Coast of Africa, by the light of the notorious fact that the crime against which the Act was directed, was mainly, if not exclusively committed there (*d*): though it may, perhaps, not have extended to our subjects in other parts of the

- (*a*) *Gorham v. Bishop of Exeter*, Rep. by Moore, p. 462; see *per* Bramwell B. in *Attorney-General v. Sillem*, 2 H. & C. 531; *per* Coleridge J. in *R. v. Blane*, 13 Q. B. 773; and *per* Thesiger L.J. in *Yewens v. Noakes*, 6 Q. B. D. 535.
- (*b*) See *Read v. Bp. of Lincoln*, [1892] A. C. 644.
- (*c*) Supplement to the *London Gazette*, 20 Sept. 1872, p. 4135.
- (*d*) *R. v. Zulueta*, 1 Car. & K. 215.

world beyond our territories (*a*). An ordinance of the colony of Hong Kong, which authorised the extradition of Chinese subjects to the government of China, when charged with "any crime or offence against the law of "China," was construed, either by reference to the circumstances under which the treaty, which the ordinance enforced, had been made, or to the geographical relation of Hong Kong to China, as limited to those crimes which all nations concur in proscribing (*b*). An Act which authorised "the Court" before which a road indictment was preferred, to give costs, was construed as authorising the judge at Nisi Prius to do so, partly on the ground of the well-known fact that such indictments were rarely tried by the Court in which they were, in the strict sense of the word, "preferred" (*c*). In construing an Extradition Act the terms of the treaty which it was intended to carry into effect should be considered, as the two documents ought not to conflict. Accordingly where the treaty provided that no extradition should be made for offences committed before it came into operation, the Act, though silent on the point, should be limited in the same way (*d*).

(*a*) *Per* Bramwell B. in *Santos v. Illidge*, 8 C. B. N. S. 861.

(*b*) *Attorney-General v. Kwok Ah Sing*. L. R. 5 P. C. 179, 197.

(*c*) *R. v. Pembridge*, 3 Q. B. 901. For another illustration see *Phillips v. Rees*, 24 Q. B. D. 17.

(*d*) 33 & 34 Vict. c. 52; *R. v. Wilson*, 3 Q. B. D. 42.

There is some presumption that statutes passed to amend the law are directed against defects which have come into notice about the time when those statutes passed; and accordingly on the ground that s. 7 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1854, was passed to correct a state of the law brought into notice by a legal warfare which had been waged about negligence only, the reference in that section to losses of goods "occasioned by the neglect or "default of" such company or its servants, has been held not to extend to a loss by the theft of a servant of the company without negligence on their part, that not being a loss by neglect or default on their part (a).

The external circumstances which may be thus referred to, do not however justify a departure from every meaning of the language of the Act. Their function is limited to suggesting a key to the true sense, when the words are fairly open to more than one, and they are to be borne in mind, with the view of applying the language to what was intended and of not extending it to what was not intended (b).

It has been said that unless for some special reason, *e.g.*, where a provision is of doubtful import, or employs words of technical meaning, the pre-

(a) 17 & 18 Vict. c. 31; M.R. in *Holme v. Guy*, 5 Ch. Shaw v. G. W. R., [1894] 1 D. 905; and R. v. Langrisville, 14 Q. B. D. 86.

(b) See the dictum of Jessel

existing law is not to be taken into consideration in construing a Consolidation Act, which implies not only the collection, but in some respects the alteration of the law (*a*).

Reference has been occasionally made to what the framers of the Act, or individual members of the Legislature intended to do by the enactment, or understood it to have done. Chief Justice Hengham said that he knew better than counsel the meaning of the 2d Westminster, as he had drawn up that statute (*b*). Lord Nottingham claimed that he had some reason to know the meaning of the Statute of Frauds, because, he said, it had had its first rise from him, he having brought it into the House of Lords (*c*). Lord Kenyon supported his construction of the statute 9 Anne, c. 20, by the argument that so accurate a lawyer as Mr. Justice Powell, who had drawn it, never would have used several words where one sufficed (*d*). Lord Field refers to the improbability that the eminent lawyers who framed the Judicature Act, 1875, would not have made a certain exception if they intended it (*e*). In determining the meaning of the rubric on vestments in the Prayer-book (enacted by the Uni-

(*a*) *Per* Lord Herschell in
Bk. of England *v.* Vagliano,
[1891] A. C. 144.

(*b*) Year Book of 33 Ed. I.,
M. Term. (Rolls Ed.) 82.

(*c*) See *Ash v. Abdy*, 3
Swanst. 664.

(*d*) *R. v. Wallis*, 5 T. R. 379.

(*e*) *Cox v. Hakes*, 15 App.
Cas. 506.

formity Act, 13 & 14 Car. II. c. 4), the Privy Council, in one Ecclesiastical case, referred to the introduction of a proviso by the Lords in that Act, and its rejection by the Commons, and to the reasons assigned by the latter, in the conference which ensued, for the rejection, as an indication of the intention of the Legislature (α); and in another, to a discussion between the bishops who framed or revised the rubric and the Presbyterian divines at the Savoy Conference in 1662, as showing the meaning attached to it by the former (b). Lord Westbury, when Chancellor, referred to a speech made by himself, as Attorney-General, in the House of Commons, in 1860, in introducing the Bankruptcy Bill, which was passed into law in the following year; and one of his reasons in favour of the construction which he put on the Act was that it tallied best with the intention which the Legislature (that is, the three branches of the Legislature) might be presumed to have adopted, as it was the ground on which application had been made to one of the three. But he observed, at the same time, that he had endeavoured, in forming his opinion, to divest his mind, as far as possible, of all impressions received from the past, and to consider the language of the Act as if it had been presented to him for the first time in the case before him (c). The reports

(α) *Hebbert v. Purchas*, L. R. D. 322.

3 P. C. 648.

(c) *Re Mew*, 31 L. J. Bey.

(b) *Ridsdale v. Clifton*, 2 P. 89.

furnish other instances (*a*). But it is unquestionably a rule that what may be called the parliamentary history of an enactment is not admissible to explain its meaning (*b*). Its language can be regarded only as the language of the three States of the realm, and the meaning attached to it by its framers or by individual members of one of those States cannot control the construction of it (*c*). Indeed, the inference to be drawn from comparing the language of the Act with the declared intention of its framers would be that the difference between the two was not accidental but intentional (*d*). Accordingly, the Dower Act of 3 & 4 Will. IV. was construed to apply to gavelkind lands, although this was avowedly contrary to the intention of the real property commissioners who prepared that Act; for they stated in their report that it was their intention that it should not extend to lands of that tenure (*e*). Sir Francis Moor, who drew the Statute of Charitable Uses, 44 Eliz. c. 4, says, in his

(*a*) *Ex. gr. per* Hale C.B. in 521, and *per* Bramwell B. 537. *Hedworth v. Jackson*, Hard. (c) *Dean of York's Case*, 2 318; *McMaster v. Lomax*, 2 Q. B. 34. *Per* Pollock C.B. Myl. & K. 32; *Mounsey v. and Parke B. in Martin v. Hem-* Ismay, 3 H. & C. 486; *Drum-* mingham, 10 Ex. 478; *Cameron v.* mond *v. Drummond*, L. R. 2 Ch. Cameron, 2 M. & K. 289; *Hem-* 45; *Hudson v. Tooth*, 3 Q. B. stead *v. Phoenix Gas Co.*, 3 H. D. 46. & C. 745.

(*b*) See *ex. gr. per* Cur. in (d) *Per* Tindal C.J. in *Sal-* R. *v. Hertford College*, 3 Q. B. keld *v. Johnson*, 2 C. B. 757. D. 707; *per* Pollock C.B. in (e) *Farley v. Bonham*, 2 Atty-Gen. *v. Sillem*, 2 H. & C. Johns. & H. 177.

reading on it, that a gift of lands to maintain a chaplain or minister for divine service, or to maintain schools for catechising, was not within its meaning, having been intentionally omitted, lest they should be confiscated; since religion being variable according to the pleasure of succeeding princes, that which was orthodox at one time might be superstitious at another, and so be forfeited (*a*); but such devises were nevertheless afterwards held to fall within the Act (*b*). So, what took place before the committee cannot be invoked for putting a construction on a private Act (*c*). But for the purpose of construing it the Court would be at liberty to consider the position of the parties concerned, and whether they could or could not have been before the committee, and may come to the conclusion that a particular clause must have been inserted on the application of a party who was present, and for the protection of his interests alone (*d*).

Another class of external circumstances which have, under peculiar circumstances, been sometimes taken into consideration, in construing a statute, consists of acts done under it; for usage may determine the meaning of the language, at all events when the meaning is not free from ambiguity (*e*).

(*a*) Duke, Char. Uses, 125.

(*d*) Taff Vale R. Co. v. Davis,

(*b*) *Id.* 134, Penstred v. Payer, [1894] 1 Q. B. 44.

Id. 381; Grieves v. Case, 4 Bro. P. C. 67.

(*e*) See ex. gr. R. v. Leveson, L. R. 4 Q. B. 394, and other

(*c*) Steele v. Midland R. Co., L. R. 1 Ch. 282.

cases referred to inf. Chap. XI, Sec. I.

SECTION IV.—THE CONTEXT—EARLIER AND LATER
ACTS—ANALOGOUS ACTS.

Passing from the external history of the statute to its contents, it is an elementary rule that construction is to be made of all the parts together, and not of one part only by itself (*a*). Incivile est, nisi tota lege perspecta, una aliqua particula ejus proposita, judicare vel respondere (*b*). Such a survey is always indispensable, even when the words are the plainest (*c*); for the true meaning of any passage is that which best harmonises with the subject, and with every other passage of the statute. If one section of an Act, for instance, required that “notice” should be “given,” a verbal notice would probably be sufficient; but if a subsequent section provided that it should be “served” on a person, or “left” with him, or in a particular manner or place, it would obviously show that a written notice was intended (*d*). The 2nd section of Lord Tenterden’s Prescription Act, 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 71, in protecting “any right of common” from dis-

(*a*) Co. Litt. 381a; Lincoln Q. B. D. 391.

College Case, 3 Rep. 59b. Per (*d*) 43 & 44 Vict. c. 42; 2
Lord Blackburn in *Turquand v. W. & M.* c. 5; *Moyle v. Jenkins*,
Board of Trade, 11 App. Cas. 286. 8 Q. B. D. 116; *Wilson v.*

(*b*) Dig. 1, 3, 34. Nightingale, 8 Q. B. 1034; R.

(*c*) Per Lord Esher M.R. and *v. Shurmer*, 17 Q. B. D. 323.
Fry L.J. in Lancashire and See Exp. Portingell, [1892] 1
Yorks. R. Co. v. Knowles, 20 Q. B. 15.

turbance after certain periods of enjoyment, uses an expression which unambiguously includes all rights of common, that is, those in gross as well as those appurtenant. But the 5th section, which, in providing a form of pleading to be applicable to all rights within the Act, gives a form which could, from its nature, be applicable only to rights appurtenant, shows that the wide expression in the earlier section was used in the restricted sense of a right of common appurtenant (a). So, in the Dower Act, of 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 105, the word "land," which it defines as including manors, messuages, and all other hereditaments, both corporeal and incorporeal, except such as are not liable to dower, was held not to include copyhold lands; because the 6th section, which provides that a widow shall not be entitled to dower, when "the deed" by which the land was conveyed to her husband contains a declaration to that effect, showed that only lands which were transferable by deed were within the contemplation of the Legislature (b). So a colonial statute which required an executor to file particulars of the "personal estate" of the testator was held to refer to such personal estate only as was held by the testator in the colony, it being clear that in other parts of the context a number of similar expressions had to be subjected to limitations or qualifications of the same

- (a) *Shuttleworth v. Le Fleming*, M. & G. 712; *Powdrell v. Jones*, 2 Sm. & G. 407. *Comp. Doe v. Waterton*, 3 B. & Ald. 149.
- (b) *Smith v. Adams*, 5 De G.

nature. One of the safest guides, it was said, to the construction of sweeping general words, which it is difficult to apply in their full literal sense, is to examine other words of like import in the same instrument, and to see what limitations must be imposed on them; and if it is found that a number of such expressions have to be subjected to limitations and qualifications, and that such limitations and qualifications are of the same nature, that forms a strong argument for subjecting the expression in dispute to a like limitation and qualification (*a*). Where one section of an Act empowered the Board of Trade, when it had "reason to believe" that a ship could not go to sea without serious danger to human life, to detain it for survey; and another gave the shipowner a right to compensation if it appeared that there was not reasonable cause for its detention, by reason of the condition of the ship or the act or default of the owner; it was held that the latter section so modified the sense of the earlier one, that the Board of Trade would be liable to compensate the owner, though it had reasonable ground for belief when it ordered the detention, if it appeared from the evidence at the trial that a person of ordinary skill would have thought that there was no reasonable ground for detention (*b*).

So, where one section of the 25 & 26 Vict. c. 102,

(*a*) *Blackwood v. R.*, 8 App. Cas. 82.

(*b*) *Thompson v. Farrer*, 9 Q. B. D. 372.

enacted, that if "any building" projecting beyond the general line of the street was pulled down, the Board of Works might order it to be set back, giving compensation; and the next enacted that under certain circumstances "no building" should be erected in any street, without the consent of the Board, beyond the general line; the latter section, which, per se, would have included alterations, whether on new sites or old, was confined by the former to buildings erected on land which had been hitherto vacant (*a*). Where one section of an Act imposed a penalty for selling "as unadulterated" articles of food which are in fact adulterated; and another declared that a person who sold an article of food "knowing it to have been mixed with another substance to increase its bulk or weight," and did not, in selling it, declare the admixture to the purchaser, should be deemed to have sold an adulterated article, the different wording of the two sections showed that under the former the seller would be liable though he was ignorant of the adulteration (*b*). A provision in an Enclosure Act which reserved to the lord his right to minerals, and to work them as fully as if the

(*a*) Lord Auckland *v.* Westminster Board of Works, L. R. 7 Ch. 597; *Wendon v. L. C. C.*, [1894] 1 Q. B. 812. Comp. *Worley v. St. Mary Abbots*, [1892] 2 Ch. 404. And see *Doe v. Olley*, 12 A. & E. 481.

(*b*) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 74; *Fitzpatrick v. Kelly*, L. R. 8 Q. B. 337. See also *Core v. James*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 135; and *Roberts v. Egerton*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 494.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>(a) Benfieldside Local Board v. Consett Iron Co., 3 Ex. D. 54.</p> <p>(b) <i>Re</i> The London Cotton</p> | <p>Co., L. R. 2 Eq. 53.</p> <p>(c) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 33, s. 9, cl. 21 & 51; Clementson v. Mason, L. R. 10 C. P. 209.</p> |
|--|---|

The words of s. 1 of the Fine Arts Copyright Act, 1862, which give to the author of every original painting the sole and exclusive right of copying, engraving, reproducing, and multiplying such painting, and the design thereof, by any means, and of any size, are seen to be inapplicable to a representation of a painting by a *tableau vivant*, when reference is made to subsequent sections, which empower the owner of the copyright to obtain a forfeiture of the piratical imitations (*a*). In all these instances, the Legislature supplied in the context the key to the meaning in which it used expressions which seemed free from doubt; and that meaning, it is obvious, was not that which literally or primarily belonged to them.

Where the later of two Acts required that it and the earlier Act should, so far as was consistent with their tenor, be construed as one, an enactment in the later statute that nothing in it should include debentures was held to exclude debentures from the earlier one also (*b*). It has been observed, however, that when an Act embodies several distinct Acts, one part throws no further light on the other parts than would be cast upon them by separate and distinct enactments to the same effect (*c*).

(*a*) 25 & 26 Vict. c. 68; Q. B. D. 300; Exp. Lowe, Hanfstaengl v. Empire Palace, [1891] 1 Ch. 627.

[1894] 2 Ch. 1.

(*c*) Per Turner L.J. in Cope

(*b*) Read v. Joannon, 25 v. Doherty, 4 K. & J. 367. As

Where a single section of an Act is introduced into another Act, it must be read in the sense which it bore in the original Act from which it is taken, and consequently it is legitimate to refer to all the rest of that Act in order to ascertain what the section meant, though those other sections are not incorporated in the new Act (*a*).

Where there are earlier Acts relating to the same subject, the survey must extend to them ; for all are, for the purposes of construction, considered as forming one homogeneous and consistent body of law (*b*), and each of them may explain and elucidate every other part of the common system to which it belongs. For instance, a bye-law which authorised the election of "any person" to be Chamberlain of the City of London would be construed so as to harmonise, and not to conflict, with an earlier one which limited the appointment to persons possessed of a certain qualification, and "any person" would be understood to mean only any eligible person (*c*). Where a question arose as to whether the Admiralty Court Act, 24 Vict. c. 10, which gives that Court jurisdiction over any

to incorporating Acts in others,
see *Knill v. Towse*, 24 Q. B. D.
186, 697.

(*a*) *Per* Lord Blackburn in
Mayor of Portsmouth v. Smith,
10 App. Cas. 371.

(*b*) *R. v. Loxdale*, 1 Burr.
445, *per* Lord Mansfield ; *Duck*

v. Addington, 4 T. R. 447 ;
Palmer's Case, 1 Leach, 355 ;
McWilliam v. Adams, 1 Macq.
H. L. 136, *per* Lord Truro.

(*c*) *Tobacco Pipe Makers v.*
Woodroffe, 7 B. & C. 838, over-
ruling *Oxford v. Wildgoose*, 3
Lev. 293.

claim for "damage" done by any ship, included injuries done to persons by collision; one reason for deciding in the negative was that in other Acts in *pari materiâ*, loss of life and personal injury, on the one hand, and loss and damage to ships and other property, on the other, appeared invariably treated distinctly, and the word "damage" was nowhere, in them, applied to injuries to the person (*a*). So, the expression "possession" in the 26th section of the Reform Act of 1832, which enacts that no person shall be registered in respect of his estate or interest in land as a freeholder, unless he has been "in actual possession" of it for six months, was construed in the same sense as in the Statute of Uses, which declares that the person who has the use of the land is to be deemed in lawful "possession" of it; and consequently the grantee of a rent-charge by a conveyance operating under the latter statute was held to be in possession of it, within the meaning of the Reform Act, from the date of the execution of the deed (*b*); though a grantee under a common law conveyance would not be in possession, within the same Act, until he had received a payment of the rent-charge (*c*). The Reform Act of 1867, 30 & 31 Vict. c. 102, which requires, as a qualifica-

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Smith v. Brown</i>, L. R. 6. Q. B. 729. But see the judgment of Baggallay L.J. in <i>The Franconia</i>, 2 P. D. 174, et seqq., and <i>The Theta</i>, [1894] P. 280.</p> | <p>(<i>b</i>) <i>Heelis v. Blain</i>, 18 C. B. N. S. 90; <i>Hadfield's Case</i>, L. R. 8 C. P. 306.</p> <p>(<i>c</i>) <i>Murray v. Thorniley</i>, 2 C. B. 217; <i>Orme's Case</i>, L. R. 8 C. P. 281.</p> |
|--|---|

tion, that the voter shall have paid all poor rates which have become payable by him up to the preceding 5th of January, was construed by the light of the earlier enactments on the same subject, as confined to rates made after the 5th of January of the preceding, and payable up to 5th of January of the qualifying year (*a*). The 12 & 13 Vict. c. 106, s. 113, which directs the discharge of a bankrupt who has been arrested for debt in coming to surrender, on production of the order of protection, and imposes a penalty on "any officer" who "detains" him, was construed by reference to the 5 Geo. II. c. 3, s. 5, which imposes a penalty on the officer who arrests a bankrupt under such circumstances, as applying only to the officer who makes the arrest, but not to the jailor who detains him (*b*).

Not only is the later Act construed by the light of the earlier, but it sometimes furnishes a legislative interpretation of the earlier. Thus chapter 23 of Magna Charta, which provides that "all weirs shall be put down through Thames and Medway, and through all England, except by the sea-coast," was held to apply only to navigable rivers, because the 25 Ed. III. and other subsequent statutes spoke of it as having been passed to prevent obstruction to navigation (*c*). To determine the meaning of the word

(*a*) *Cull v. Austin*, L. R. 7
C. P. 227.

(*b*) *Myers v. Veitch*, L. R. 4
Q. B. 649.

(*c*) 25 Ed. III. stat. 4, c.
4; *Rolle v. Whyte*, L. R. 3
Q. B. 286; *Callis on Sewers*,
258.

"broker," in the 6 Anne, c. 16, the Bubble Act (6 Geo. I. c. 18), passed twelve years later, was referred to, where the same term was used (*a*). In s. 299 of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854, which enacts that damage arising from non-observance of the sailing rules shall be *prima facie* deemed to have been occasioned by "the wilful default" of the person in charge of the deck, the expression "wilful default" was construed by the light of the later Shipping Act of 1862, the 24th section of which declares that the ship which occasioned the collision shall be deemed to be "in fault," as including a negligent as well as a criminal default (*b*). But where one Act (1 & 2 Vict. c. 110, s. 18) gave the effect of judgments to rules of Court, for the payment of money, and a later one (the Common Law Procedure Act, 1854, s. 60) authorised creditors who obtained judgment to recover the amount by the new process, which it introduced, of foreign attachment, it was held that this remedy did not apply to rules of Court, the object of the former Act appearing to be merely to give to rules the then existing remedies of judgments, and of the latter, to confine the new remedy to judgments in the strict acceptation of the term (*c*).

General rules and forms made under the authority of an Act which enacted that they should have the

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Clarke v. Powell</i>, 4 B. & Ad. 846; <i>Smith v. Lindo</i>, 4 C. B. N. S. 395.</p> <p>(<i>b</i>) <i>Grill v. The Screw Collier</i></p> | <p>Co., L. R. 1 C. P. 611, <i>per Willes J.</i></p> <p>(<i>c</i>) <i>Re Frankland</i>, L. R. 8 Q. B. 18; <i>Best v. Pembroke</i>, L. R. 8 Q. B. 363.</p> |
|--|--|

same force as if they had been included in it have also been referred to for the purpose of assisting in the interpretation of the Act (*a*). And now by the Interpretation Act, 1889, s. 31, it is provided that rules, orders, etc., made under an Act shall be construed as using expressions in the same sense as the Act (*b*).

The language and provisions of expired and repealed Acts on the same subject, and the construction which they have authoritatively received, are also to be taken into consideration ; for it is presumed that the Legislature uses the same language in the same sense, when dealing at different times with the same subject, and also that any change of language is some indication of a change of intention (*c*). Thus, the 202nd section of the Bankrupt Act of 1849, which makes "void" all securities given by a bankrupt to a creditor to induce the latter to forbear opposition to the bankrupt's certificate, was construed in the same sense as that which had been given to the same provision in the earlier and repealed Bankrupt Act of the 6 Geo. IV. (*d*). What was meant in the Vagrant Act, 5 Geo. IV. c. 8, by "running away, leaving his or her child "chargeable to the parish," was determined by referring

(*a*) *Re Andrew*, 1 Ch. D. 358.

(*c*) See Chap. XI, Sec. III.

(*b*) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63.

(*d*) *Goldsmid v. Hampton*, 5

See *Institute of Patent Agents v. Lockwood*, [1894] A. C. 360, post, p. 72.

C. B. N. S. 94; see also *Exp. Copeland*, 2 De G. M. & G. 914.

to the earlier Act of 5 Geo. I., which spoke of persons who "run or go away from their abodes into other "counties or places, and sometimes out of the king- "dom," and was therefore held not to apply to a woman who left her children at the door of the workhouse, and returned to her usual abode in the town, where the workhouse was situated (*a*). Where a repealed Act imposed a penalty on the owner of cattle found lying on a highway "without a keeper," and the same provision was re-enacted without the last words, the omission was construed as obviously showing the intention that the presence of a keeper should no longer absolve the owner from liability (*b*).

Where a part of an Act has been repealed, it must, although not of operative force, still be taken into consideration in construing the rest, for it is part of the history of the new Act (*c*). If, for instance, an Act which imposed a duty on racehorses, cabhorses, and all other horses were repealed as regards racehorses, the remaining words would still obviously include them, if the enactment were read as if the repealed words had never formed a part of it (*d*). Where a statute imposed a duty on artificial mineral waters and on all other waters

(*a*) *Cambridge Union v. Parr*, Dears. & P. 626; *Exp. Gorely*, 10 C. B. N. S. 99, *per Byles* 34 L. J. Bcy. 1.

J.

(*c*) See pp. 30-31.

(*b*) 27 & 28 Vict. c. 101, s. 25; *Lawrence v. King*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 345; see also *R. v. Moah*, (*d*) *Per Bramwell L.J.* in *Atty.-Gen. v. Lamplough*, 3 Ex. D. 214.

to be used as medicines, and the duty on artificial mineral waters was afterwards repealed, the repealed words were held essential for determining whether what still subsisted of the Act, though wide enough to include artificial waters, was intended to include them (*a*). It has been said, however, to be an extremely hazardous proceeding to refer to provisions which have been absolutely repealed, in order to ascertain what the Legislature meant to enact in their stead, though there may possibly be occasions on which such a reference would be legitimate (*b*).

The construction which has been put upon Acts of similar scope on similar subjects, even though the language should be different, should for a similar reason be referred to. Thus, the Insolvent Act, 1 & 2 Vict. c. 110, s. 37, which vested in the provisional assignee all the insolvent's debts which became due to him before his discharge, received the same construction as a similar provision in the Bankrupt Act of 6 Geo. IV. (*c*). The provision of the 9 Geo. IV. c. 14, requiring that an acknowledgment to take a debt out of the Statute of Limitations should be signed "by the party chargeable thereby," was held not to include an acknowledgment by his agent, on the ground that when the Legislature intended to include

(*a*) *Atty.-Gen. v. Lamplough*,
ubi sup.

(*b*) *Per Lord Watson in Brad-*
laugh v. Clarke, 8 App. Cas. 354.

(*c*) *Jackson v. Burnham*, 8
Ex. 173; *Herbert v. Sayer*, 5
Q. B. 965.

the signature of agents, not only in other Statutes of Limitations, but also in several sections of the Statute of Frauds, one of which was recited in the Act, express words had been used for the purpose (*a*). So the County Court Act of 1867, which gives jurisdiction in ejectment when the value of the tenement does not exceed twenty pounds, was construed, as regards the measure of value, by reference to the Parliamentary Assessment Act (*b*). That which was held a sufficient signature to a will or contract under the Statute of Frauds (*c*) was held for that reason sufficient under the Bankrupt Act, 6 Geo. IV. c. 16, s. 131 (*d*), under the Statute of Limitations (*e*), and under the Registration of Voters Act (*f*).

But where the Acts are not in *pari materia*, it is fallacious to take the construction which has been put upon one as a guide to the construction of another (*g*). For instance, the meaning put on the word "goods"

(*a*) *Hyde v. Johnson*, 2 Bing. N. C. 776.

(*b*) 31 & 32 Vict. c. 142, s. 11; *Elston v. Rose*, L. R. 4 Q. B. 4.

(*c*) *Lemayne v. Stanley*, 3 Lev. 1; *Knight v. Crockford*, 1 Esp. 190; *Hubert v. Treherne*, 3 M. & Gr. 743.

(*d*) *Ogilvy v. Foljambe*, 3 Mer. 53; *Kirkpatrick v. Tattersall*, 13 M. & W. 766.

(*e*) *Lobb v. Stanley*, 5 Q. B. 574, *per* Patteson J.

(*f*) 6 & 7 Vict. c. 18, s. 17; *Bennett v. Brunfitt*, L. R. 3 C. P. 28. *Comp. R. v. Cowper*, 24 Q. B. D. 60, 533.

(*g*) *Dewhurst v. Feilden*, 7 M. & Gr. 187, *per* Maule J.; *Eyre v. Waller*, 5 H. & N. 460, *per* Wilde B. *Re Lord Gerard's Estate*, [1893] 3 Ch. 251.

in the reputed ownership clause of the Bankrupt Acts would be no guide to its meaning in the 17th section of the Statute of Frauds, not only because the words associated with it are different, but because the objects of the Act are wholly different (*a*). For the same reason, the Parochial Assessment Act, 6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 96, was held to throw no light on the meaning of "the clear yearly value" of a tenement which qualified a voter under the Reform Act of 1832 (*b*). Because chambers are "a house" for the purposes of assessment to a poor rate under the 43 Eliz. c. 2 (*c*), of gaining a settlement under the 6 Geo. IV. c. 57 (*d*), of qualifying for a vote under the Reform Act of 1832 (*e*), and also as a place in which a burglary might be committed (*f*), it did not follow that the same meaning was to be given to the expression in the 48 Geo. III. c. 55, which imposed a duty on "inhabited houses" (*g*). A bicycle, which is a "carriage" within an enactment against furious driving, would not necessarily be also a carriage under a turnpike Act

(*a*) *Humble v. Mitchell*, 11 Nordenfelt, [1895] 1 Q. B. 151. A. & E. 205. (*d*) *R. v. Ushworth*, 5 A. &

(*b*) 2 Will. IV. c. 45, s. 27 E. 261.

(repealed but re-enacted with modifications in 48 & 49 Vict. B. N. S. 500. (*e*) *Henrette v. Booth*, 15 C.

c. 3, s. 5); *Colvill v. Wood*, 2 C. B. 210; *Dobbs v. Grand* 473. (*f*) *Evans' Case*, Cro. Car.

Junc. W. Ws., 9 App. Cas. 49. (*g*) *Atty.-Gen. v. Westminster*

(*c*) *R. v. St. George's Union*, Chambers Assoc., 1 Ex. D. 469. L. R. 7 Q. B. 90. *Comp. Re* See also *R. v. Oxford (V.C.)*, *Hecquard*, 24 Q. B. D. 71; *Re* L. R. 7 Q. B. 471.

which imposed a toll on carriages impelled by steam or other agency (*a*).

It may be added that in construing Acts of a private or local character, such as railway Acts, the Courts do not shut their eyes to the fact that special clauses, frequently found embodied in them, are in effect private arrangements between the promoters and particular persons; and are not inserted by the Legislature as part of a general scheme of legislation, but are simply introduced at the request of the parties concerned. If the general provisions of such Acts were to override such special clauses, those in whose favour the latter are inserted would have a just claim to be heard in Committee on every clause of the Act, which would make it impossible to conduct any private legislation (*b*). Such special clauses are therefore treated as isolated, and foreign to the rest of the Act; so that their wording, contrary to the general rule, is not to be regarded as throwing any light on the construction of it (*c*).

SECTION V.—THE TITLE—THE PREAMBLE—MARGINAL
NOTES—SCHEDULE—RULES AND ORDERS.

Originally, bills in Parliament were mere petitions to the King. They were entered on the rolls of

- | | |
|---|--|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Williams v. Ellis</i> , 5 Q. B. D. 175. | (<i>c</i>) <i>Per Lord Cairns in East London R. Co. v. Whitechurch</i> , |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Per Jessel M.R. in Taylor v. Oldham</i> , 4 Ch. D. 410. | L. R. 7 H. L. 89. |

Parliament, with the King's answer ; and at the end of the session, the Judges drew up these records into statutes to which they gave a title (*a*). In the execution of their task, they occasionally made additions, omissions, and alterations ; but the practice ceased in the reign of Henry VI., when bills in the form of statutes without titles were introduced (*b*). The title was first added about the eleventh year of Henry VII. (*c*). In the Lords the original title of a bill is amended at any stage at which amendments are admissible, when alterations in the body of the bill have rendered any change in the title necessary ; but in the Commons, the original title is not amended, during the progress of the bill, to render it conformable with amendments which may have been made to the bill since its first introduction, unless the House agree to divide one bill into two, or combine two into one, or the Committee have amended the title. Such amendments are accordingly offered to the title on the third reading stage of a bill (*d*). The title is always on the roll (*e*).

Although the title of a statute is thus recognised and attached to it by Parliament, it has long been established by numerous judicial decisions or dicta,

(*a*) Co. Litt. 272a.

(*c*) Barrington Obs. Stat. 403.

(*b*) *Per* Lord Macclesfield, *se*
defendendo, 16 St. Tr. 1389.

(*d*) May, Parlm. Pr., 10th
ed. chap. 19, p. 473.

May, Parlm. Pr., 10th ed.
chap. 19, p. 434.

(*e*) *Per* Jessel M.R. in *Sutton*
v. Sutton, 22 Ch. D. 511.

from Lord Coke's to the present time, that it is not a part of the statute, and is to be, therefore, excluded from consideration in construing the statute. "The title cannot be resorted to," says Lord Cottenham, "in construing the enactment" (a). "The title, though it has occasionally been referred to as aiding in the construction of an Act, is certainly no part of the law," it is said by the Court of Exchequer, in a well-known and considered judgment, "and, in strictness, ought not to be taken into consideration at all" (b). And Lord Denman remarked that the Court had often laid that down (c).

The rule has not, indeed, been invariably observed (d); for the mind, when labouring to discover

(a) *Hunter v. Nockolds*, 1 McN. & Gord. 651.

(b) *Per Cur.* in *Salkeld v. Johnson*, 2 Ex. 283, citing Lord Coke in *Powlter's Case*, 11 Rep. 33b; Lord Holt in *Mills v. Wilkins*, 6 Mod. 62; Lord Hardwicke in *Atty.-Gen. v. Weymouth*, Amb. 22; Lord Mansfield in *R. v. Williams*, 1 W. Bl. 95. See also *Chance v. Adams*, 1 Lord Raym. 77; and *per Byles J.* in *Shrewsbury v. Scott*, 6 C. B. N. S. 1; *per Lord St. Leonards* in *Jeffreys v. Boosey*, 4 H. L. 982; *per Grove J.* in *Morant v. Taylor*, 1

Ex. D. 194; *per Willes J.* in *Claydon v. Green*, L. R. 3 C. P. 522; and the American case, *Hadden v. The Collector*, 5 Wallace, 110.

(c) *R. v. Wilcock*, 7 Q. B. 329.

(d) See *ex. gr. R. v. Wright*, 1 A. & E. 446; *Alexander v. Newman*, 2 C. B. 141; *Taylor v. Newman*, 4 Best & S. 93; *Rawley v. Rawley*, 1 Q. B. D. 466; *Bentley v. Rotheram*, 4 Ch. D. 588; *East and West India Docks v. Shaw*, 39 Ch. D. 531; *per Selborne L.C.* in *Middlesex Justices v. R.*, 9 App. Cas. 772.

the design of the Legislature, naturally seizes on everything from which aid can be derived (*a*). It has even been occasionally asserted that its title was part of a statute, and was not to be disregarded in construing it (*b*). But it does not seem that on those occasions, attention was directed to the established rule (*c*).

Formerly, the bill was, at one of its stages, engrossed without punctuation on parchment (*d*); but as neither the marginal notes nor the punctuation appeared on the roll, they formed no parts of the Act (*e*). This practice was discontinued in 1849, since which time the record of the statutes is a copy printed on vellum by the Queen's printer (*f*). Both marginal notes and punctuation now appear on the rolls of Parliament;

(*a*) *Per Cur.* in *U. S. v. Fisher*, 2 Cranch, 386; *U. S. v. Palmer*, 3 Wheat. 631.

(*b*) See *Brett v. Brett*, 3 Addams, Ec. 217; *Hinton v. Dibben*, 2 Q. B. 663, *per Cur.*; *Wilmot v. Rose*, 3 E. & B. 570, *per Lord Campbell*; *Free v. Burgoyne*, 2 Bligh N. S. 78; *Blake v. Midland R.*, 18 Q. B. 109; *Johnson v. Upham*, 2 E. & E. 263; *Allkins v. Jupe*, 2 C. P. D. 383; and *Coomber v. Berks*, 9 Q. B. D. 26. And see *per Wills J.* in *Kenrick v. Lawrence*, 25 Q. B. D. 104.

(*c*) The statute 31 & 32 Vict. c. 89 contains, in s. 1, a reference to certain Acts specified in the title as "the said Acts"; see *Hardcastle on Statutes*, 212 (2nd ed. by W. F. Craies, 1892).

(*d*) 1 Bl. Com. (Ed. 1770) 183.

(*e*) *Barrington, Obs. on Stat.* 394; see *Barrow v. Wadkin*, 24 Beav. 327; and the judgment of *Maule J.* in *R. v. Oldham*, 21 L. J. M. C. 134.

(*f*) *May, Parl. P.*, 10th ed. chap. 19, p. 486.

nevertheless, they are not taken as parts of the statute (a).

The indorsement by the Clerk of the Parliaments of the date of the passing of the Act is part of it since 1793 (b).

No introductory words are necessary to each section (c).

The preamble of a statute has been said to be a good means to find out its meaning, and, as it were, a key to the understanding of it ; and as it usually states, or professes to state, the general object and intention of the Legislature in passing the enactment, it may legitimately be consulted for the purpose of solving any ambiguity, or of fixing the meaning of words which may have more than one, or of keeping the effect of the Act within its real scope, whenever the enacting part is in any of these respects open to doubt (d). Thus, in the 26 Geo. III. c. 107, s. 3,

- | | |
|---|---|
| (a) <i>Per</i> Willes J. in <i>Claydon v. Green</i> , L. R. 3 C. P. 521, | (b) 33 Geo. III. c. 13. |
| <i>per</i> James L.J. in <i>Atty.-Gen. v. G. E. R. Co.</i> , 11 Ch. D. 465 ; <i>per</i> Jessel M.R. in <i>Sutton v. Sutton</i> , 22 Ch. D. 513, | (c) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 8. |
| retracting his opinion in <i>Re Venour</i> , 2 Ch. D. 525 ; and <i>per</i> Lord Esher M.R. in <i>Duke of Devonshire v. O'Connor</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 478 ; and see <i>R. v. Milverton</i> , 5 A. & E. 841. | (d) <i>Bac. Ab. Stat. (I.)</i> 2 ; <i>Co. Litt.</i> 79a, 4 <i>Inst.</i> 330, <i>Plowd.</i> 369 ; <i>Halton v. Cove</i> , 1 B. & Ad. 558 ; <i>Beard v. Rowan</i> , 9 Peters, 317 ; <i>The People v. Utica Insurance Co.</i> , 15 Johns. N. Y. Rep. 389 ; <i>per</i> Lord Selborne in <i>Turquand v. Board of Trade</i> , 11 App. Cas. 286. |

which empowered every person who had served in the militia and was married, to set up in trade in a corporate town, as freely as soldiers might under an earlier enactment, and declared that "no such militia-man" should be removable from the town until he became chargeable,—it being open to doubt whether this expression included all married militiamen, or only married militiamen who had set up in trade in towns, the preamble of the earlier Act fixed the latter as the true construction, as it stated that the mischief to be remedied was the state of the law which prevented soldiers from setting up in trade in corporate towns (a). So, as an Act which authorised aliens who "shall have been resident" in the country for two years, to hold land, might either be limited to persons who had so resided before the passing of the Act, or extend to those who should at any time reside for the required time, the preamble was resorted to in order to determine which of the two meanings was the most agreeable to the policy and object of the Act; and as it recited that aliens were prevented by law from holding lands in the State, and it was the interest of the State that such prohibitions should be done away with, it showed that the former construction was less adapted to give effect to the intention of the Legislature than the latter (b). The 137th section of the Bankrupt Act of 1849, which enacted that a judge's order to sign judg-

(a) *R. v. Gwenop*, 3 T. R.
133.

(b) *Beard v. Rowan*, 9 Peters,
301.

ment, given by a trader defendant, should be void if not filed, was held limited to traders who became bankrupt, by the heading prefixed to the section which professed to enact it "with respect to transactions with the bankrupt" (*a*). A wider construction, it may be added, would have had the unjust effect of enabling the trader who had not become bankrupt to set aside as void his own deliberate act, an intention not to be imputed to the Legislature, if the language admits of any other meaning (*b*). The 18th section of the 12 & 13 Vict. c. 45 which enacted that "any order" of Quarter Sessions might be removed to the Queen's Bench for enforcement, was similarly confined to orders in appeal cases, by the preamble which, in reciting that it was expedient that the law should be made uniform in cases of appeal, showed the limited scope of the Act (*c*). Under a statute which enacted that when a person came into the occupation of premises for which the preceding tenant was rated to the poor, the old and new occupants should be liable to the rate in proportion to the time of their occupation, the question arose whether either, and if so, which of them, was to pay for the interval between the removal and the beginning of the second occupation; and this was determined by the preamble, which, by reciting that in consequence of rated occupiers

(*a*) *Bryan v. Child*, 5 Ex. 368.

(*c*) *R. v. Bateman*, 8 E. & B. 584.

(*b*) See Chap. VIII, Sec. III.

removing without paying their rates, and other persons entering and occupying the premises for a part of the year, great sums were lost to the parish, showed that the object of the Act was not to make an equitable adjustment between the two occupiers, but to protect the parish from loss. It was therefore held that the rates were payable for the interval between the two occupations, and that the burden fell on the outgoing tenant, who was formerly liable under the Act of Elizabeth for the whole rate (a). An Act which made it penal for a publican to allow bad characters to "assemble and meet together" in his house, would not be broken by his permitting such persons to enter for taking refreshment, and remaining there as long as was reasonably necessary for that purpose; when the preamble showed that the object in view was the repression of disorderly conduct, not the absolute denial of all hospitality to persons of bad character (b). In the 25 Geo. II. c. 6, which recited in the preamble a doubt as to who were legal witnesses to a will of land, and enacted that legatees and devisees who attested "any will" should be good witnesses, but that the bequests and devises to them should be void, the enacting part was limited by the preamble to wills of land. Wills of personalty, at that time, needed no

(a) 17 Geo. II. c. 38, s. 12,
repealed by 32 & 33 Vict. c.
41, s. 16; *Edwards v. Rusholme*,
L. R. 4 Q. B. 554.

(b) 23 Vict. c. 27, s. 32;
Greig v. Bendeno, E. B. & E.
133. See *Belasco v. Hannant*,
3 Best & S. 13.

attestation ; and the principle of *cessante ratione cessat lex*, as well as the injustice of depriving persons of property, making it reasonably doubtful whether the Legislature had used the expression "any will" in its full and unrestricted meaning, the preamble was legitimately invoked to determine the scope of the enactment (*α*).

But the preamble cannot either restrict or extend the enacting part, when the language and the object and scope of the Act are not open to doubt (*β*). It is not unusual to find that the enacting part is not exactly co-extensive with the preamble. In many Acts of Parliament, although a particular mischief is recited, the legislative provisions extend beyond it. The preamble is often no more than a recital of some of the inconveniences, and does not exclude any others for which a remedy is given by the

- (*α*) *Emanuel v. Constable*, 3 Russ. 436, overruling *Lees v. Summerrill*, 17 Ves. 508 ; *Brett v. Brett*, 3 Addams, 219. See other instances in *Wethered v. Calcutt*, 5 Scott, N. R. 409 ; *Doe v. Roe*, 1 Dowl. 547 ; *Carr v. Royal Exchange Ass. Co.*, 5 Best & S. 941 ; *Re Masters*, 33 L. J. Q. B. 146.
- (*β*) 4 Inst. 330 ; *per Lord Mansfield in Patteson v. Banks*, Cowp. 543, and *Perkins v. Sewell*, 1 W. Bl. 659 ; *per Dampier J. in Trueman v. Lambert*, 4 M. & S. 239 ; *Wright v. Nuttall*, 10 B & C. 492 ; *Crespigny v. Wittenoom*, 4 T. R. 793, *per Buller J.* ; *Salters' Co. v. Jay*, 3 Q. B. 109 ; *Wilmot v. Rose*, 3 E. & B. 563 ; *Copland v. Davies*, L. R. 5 H. L. 358 ; *Bentley v. Rotheram*, 4 Ch. D. 588.

statute (a). The evil recited is but the motive for legislation ; the remedy may both consistently and wisely be extended beyond the cure of that evil (b) ; and if on a review of the whole Act a wider intention than that expressed in the preamble appears to be the real one, effect is to be given to it notwithstanding the less extensive import of the preamble (c). Thus, the 4 & 5 Ph. & M. c. 8 made the abduction of all girls under sixteen penal, though the preamble referred only to heiresses and other girls with fortunes (d). So, the 13 Eliz. c. 10, which makes void all leases, gifts, grants and conveyances of estates, made by any dean and chapter, or master of an hospital, of any hereditaments, parcel of the possessions of the cathedral church or hospital, except for the limited term allowed by the Act, was not narrowed or controlled by a preamble which recited only that divers ecclesiastical persons, endowed of ancient palaces, mansions, and buildings belonging to their benefices, not only suffered them to go to decay, but converted the materials to their own benefit, and conveyed away their goods and chattels to defeat their successors' claims for dilapidations (e). The 5 Geo. IV. c. 84, s. 26, which, after reciting that transported felons in New

(a) *Per* Fortescue J. in *R. v. Athos*, 8 Mod. 144. and see *Copeman v. Gallant*, 1 P. Wms. 320.

(b) *Per* Lord Denman, in (d) *Co. Litt.* 88 b. n. 14.

Fellowes v. Clay, 4 Q. B. 349. (e) *York v. Middleborough*,

(c) *Per* Lord Tenterden, in 2 Y & J. 196, 214.

Doe v. Brandling, 7 B. & C. 660;

South Wales, after obtaining remissions, sometimes "by their industry acquired property, in the enjoyment "whereof it was expedient to protect them," enacted that every felon who received such remission should be entitled to sue for the recovery of any property, real or personal, acquired since his conviction, was held not limited by the preamble to property acquired by his own exertions, but applied to all property howsoever acquired, as for instance by inheritance (a). It has been more than once decided that the preamble of the 37 Geo. III. c. 123, which refers only to the mischiefs consequent on inciting men to sedition and mutiny, and on administering to them oaths with this object, did not restrict the enacting part of the statute, which made it felony to administer oaths not only with a view to mutinous or seditious purposes, but also with a view to disturb the peace, or to be a member of any association for any such purpose, or not to reveal any unlawful combination or illegal act; but that the latter words included offences foreign to politics and military discipline, such as the administration of oaths to poachers not to betray their companions, and to workmen similarly binding them to secrecy as members of an association for raising wages by a strike, or for not working under certain prices (b). So the preamble of the 14 Geo. III.

(a) *Gough v. Davies*, 2 K. & 571; *R. v. Marks*, 3 East, 157; J. 623. *R. v. Loveless*, 1 M. & Rob.

(b) *R. v. Brodribb*, 6 C. & P. 349; *R. v. Ball*, 6 C. & P. 563.

c. 78, which declared that an earlier Act for the regulation of buildings and the prevention of fire in the cities of London and Westminster had been found inefficacious, and that it would tend to the safety of the inhabitants of those cities if other regulations were established, was not suffered to restrict to the metropolis the 83rd section of that Act, which enacted in general terms that in order to deter persons from wilfully setting fire to their houses, with a view to gain to themselves the insurance money, the directors of insurance offices should, in suspicious cases, lay out the insurance money in reinstating the damaged buildings (*a*). This construction, however, was further justified by the circumstance that the section in question was a re-enactment of a similar provision in the earlier and repealed Act, with the significant omission of the words "within the limits "aforesaid," which words remained in most of the other sections of the later Act. The 11th section of the 21 Jac. I. c. 19, which empowered bankruptcy commissioners to dispose of goods which were in the possession of the bankrupt, as reputed owner, with the real owner's consent, was prefaced by a preamble which recited the mischief of bankrupts "secretly conveying" their goods to other persons, and yet remaining in the reputed ownership of them; but the enactment was not confined to this particular form of the mischief (*b*).

(*a*) Exp. Gorely, 4 De G. J. Cr. & M. 353.
& S. 477, *per* Lord Westbury. (*b*) Mace v. Cadell, Cowp.
See also Owen v. Burnett, 2 232.

The 3 Jac. I. c. 10, which, after reciting that the King's subjects were charged with conveying "felons and other malefactors and offenders against the law," to jail, punishable by imprisonment there, enacted that "every person" committed to the county jail by a justice "for any offence or misdemeanor," should bear his own charges of conveyance, if he had property, and that if he had not, they should be borne by the parish where he was apprehended, was held not to be confined by the preamble to offenders against the ordinary law, but to apply to deserters from the army (a). So, the preamble of the 22 Geo. III. c. 75 (b), which recited the mischief of granting colonial offices to persons who remained in England, and discharged the duties of their offices by deputy, was not suffered to exclude judicial offices from the general enacting part, which authorised the Governor and Council to remove "any" office-holder for misconduct; although the mention of delegation in the preamble showed that the judicial office was not there in contemplation (c).

The 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 100, which after reciting that the expense and inconvenience of suits for the recovery of tithes ought to be prevented by shortening the time required for the valid establishment of claims to exemption from tithes, enacted that when a claim to tithes was made by a layman, a claim to exemp-

(a) *R. v. Pierce*, 3 M. & S. 62. *Shelburne's*; see *Shelb. Life*, Vol. III. p. 337.

(b) Commonly attributed to *Burke*, but really an Act of Lord *Willis v. Gipps*, 5 Moo. P. C. 379.

tion should be deemed conclusively established by proof of non-payment for sixty years, gave rise to a celebrated legal controversy, in which the effect of the preamble was much considered. Before the passing of that Act, no layman could establish exemption from tithes, except by proving that the land in respect of which they were claimed had formerly belonged to one of the great monasteries, and had been exempt in its hands ; the latter proposition being usually established by such evidence of non-payment in modern times as sufficed for founding the inference of exemption. It was held by some of the judges (*a*), that the enactment was confined to claims of this kind ; and the preamble was invoked in support of this view. But it was considered by others (*b*), and finally decided (*c*), that the Act applied to all cases whatsoever ; and that upon proof of non-payment for sixty years, the landowner was exempt, whether the land had ever been monastic or not. The enactment was free from ambiguity, and contained no flexible expression capable of different meanings (*d*) ; while the preamble, which one side understood as meaning that the expense and inconvenience of the same kind of suits as before ought to be prevented, was thought on the other to mean that

(*a*) Wigram V.C., Tindal Parke, Alderson, and Platt B.B.
C.J., Cresswell J., Patteson J.,
and Coleridge J.

(*c*) By Lord Cottenham.

(*b*) Lord Denman, Williams, Salkeld v. Johnson, 1 Mac. &
Coltman, Erle J.J., Pollock C.B., G. 264.

(*d*) *Per* Lord Cottenham, in

expensive and inconvenient suits ought to be prevented in all cases; and that this was best effected by giving the more easy method of establishing exemptions by simple proof of non-payment for a certain time (a).

Where the preamble is found more extensive than the enacting part, it is equally inefficacious to control the effect of the latter, when otherwise free from doubt. For instance, the Act of 3 W. & M. c. 14, s. 3 (b), which gave creditors an action of "debt" against the devisees of their debtor was held not to authorise an action for a breach of covenant, or for the recovery of money not strictly a "debt" (c); though the preamble recited that it was not just that by the contrivance of debtors their creditors should be defrauded of their debts, but that it had often happened that after binding themselves by bonds "and other specialties" they devised away their property. The mention, it was observed, of the action of debt in the enacting part was almost an express exclusion of every other (d). An Act which made it penal to dye seeds so as to give them the appearance of seeds of "another kind," could not be extended to similar

(a) See *Salkeld v. Johnson*, East, 128; *Farley v. Briant*, 3 1 Mac. & G. 242, *Fellowes v. A. & E. 839*; *Jenkins v. Briant*, Clay, 4 Q. B. 313. 6 Sim. 603; *Morse v. Tucker*,

(b) Amended by 1 Will. IV. 5 Hare, 79.

c. 47, s. 3.

(d) *Per* Lord Ellenborough,

(c) *Wilson v. Knubley*, 7 7 East, 135.

manipulations of old or inferior seeds, to make them appear as new of the same species, by a recital that the practice of adulterating seeds in fraud of the Queen's subjects and the detriment of agriculture required repression (a). An Act which required the trustees of a turnpike trust to apply the monies which they received, first, in paying "any interest which might from time to time be owing," next, in keeping the road in repair, and finally, in paying off the principal sums due by the trust, was held not to authorise the payment of arrears of interest; although this enactment was prefaced by a preamble which recited that arrears of interest as well as principal sums were due by the trust, and could not be paid off unless further powers were granted (b). Such an extension of the Act, however, would have required very clear words, since it would have had the effect of throwing on the rate-payers of one year a burden properly belonging to those of another (c).

It has been sometimes said that the preamble may extend, but cannot restrain the enacting part of a statute (d). But it would seem difficult to support

(a) *Francis v. Maas*, 3 Q. B. 320; *per* Lord Abinger in *D. 341.* *Walker v. Richardson*, 2 M. &

(b) *Market Harborough v. W. 889; per Willes J. in Hayman v. Flewker*, 13 C. B. N. S. 308.

(c) See Chap. X, Sec. II. 526; *per* Turner L.J. in *Drummond v. Drummond*, L. R. 2

(d) *R. v. Athos*, 8 Mod. 144, *Copeman v. Gallant*, 1 P. Wms. Ch. 44; *per* Crowder J. in

this proposition (*a*). Several of the cases above cited might be referred to as instances of a restricted meaning having been judicially given to an enactment by its preamble (*b*). It could hardly be doubted that a statute which, in general terms, made it felony to alter a bill of exchange, would be restrained to fraudulent alterations, by a preamble which recited that it was desirable to suppress cheats and frauds effected by altering bills (*c*). The function of the preamble is to explain what is ambiguous in the enactment (*d*), and it may either restrain or extend it as best suits the intention.

The headings prefixed to sections or sets of sections in some modern statutes are regarded as preambles to those sections (*e*).

Kearns *v.* Cordwainers' Co., 6 C. B. N. S. 388. 524; Wigan *v.* Fowler, cited 1 Stark, 459.

(*a*) See ex. gr. *per* Parker C.B. and Lord Hardwicke in Ryall *v.* Rolle, 1 Atk. 174, 182. 434, arg. (c) R. *v.* Bigg, 3 P. Wms.

And see *per* Lord Blackburn in West Ham Overseers *v.* Iles, 8 A. C. 386. 389. (*d*) The People *v.* Utica Insur. Co., 15 Johns. N. Y. Rep.

(*e*) See ex. gr. Bryan *v.* Child, 5 Ex. 368; Shrewsbury *v.* Beazley, 19 C. B. N. S. 651; E. C. R. Co. *v.* Marriage, 9 H. L. 41; Latham *v.* Lafone, L. R. 2 Ex. 119; Hammersmith Ry. Co. *v.* Brand, L. R. 4 H. L. 171; Lang *v.* Kerr, 3 App. Cas. 536; Rayson *v.* South London Tram-

(*b*) R. *v.* Gwenop, 3 T. R. 133; R. *v.* Bateman; Edwards *v.* Rusholme; Emanuel *v.* Constable; Bryan *v.* Child; Salkeld *v.* Johnson, sup., pp. 61, 62, 68. See also *per* Cur. R. *v.* Manchester, 7 E. & B. 453; Hughes *v.* Chester R. Co., 1 Dr. & Sm.

Rules made under an Act which prescribes that they shall be laid before Parliament for forty days, during which period they may be annulled by a resolution of either House, but that if not so annulled they are to be of the same effect as if contained in the Act, and are to be judicially noticed, must be treated for all purposes of construction or obligation or otherwise, exactly as if they were in the Act. If there is a conflict between one of these rules and a section of the Act, it must be dealt with in the same spirit as a conflict between two sections of the Act should be dealt with. If reconciliation is impossible, the subordinate provision must give way, and probably the rule would be treated as subordinate to the section (α).

In a word, then, it is to be taken as a fundamental principle, standing, as it were, at the threshold of the whole subject of interpretation, that the intention of the Legislature is invariably to be accepted and carried into effect, whatever may be the opinion of the judicial interpreter, of its wisdom or justice. If the language admits of no doubt or secondary meaning, it is simply to be obeyed, without more. If it admits of more

ways Co., [1893] 2 Q. B. 304 ; *v. Melbourne Commissioners*, 9 *per* Brett L.J. in *R. v. Local App. Cas.* 365.
Govt. Bd., 10 Q. B. D. 321. (α) *Per* Lord Herschell L.C.
Comp. Broadbent v. Imperial in Institute of Patent Agents v.
Gas Co., 7 De G. M. & G. 436 ; *Lockwood*, [1894] A. C. at p.
Union S.S. Co. of New Zealand 360.

than one construction, the true meaning is to be sought, not on the wide sea of surmise and speculation, but "from such conjectures as are drawn from the words "alone, or something contained in them" (α); that is, from the context viewed by such light as its history may throw upon it, and construed with the help of certain general principles, and under the influence of certain presumptions as to what the Legislature does or does not generally intend.

(a) Puff. L. N. b. 5, c. 12, s. 2, note by Barbeyrac.

CHAPTER II.

SECTION I.—WORDS UNDERSTOOD ACCORDING TO THE SUBJECT MATTER.

THE words of a statute are to be understood in the sense in which they best harmonise with the subject of the enactment and the object which the Legislature has in view (*a*). Their meaning is found not so much in a strictly grammatical or etymological propriety of language, nor even in its popular use, as in the subject or in the occasion on which they are used, and the object to be attained (*b*). It is not because the words of a statute, or the words of any document, read in one sense will cover the case, that that is the right sense. Grammatically they may cover it; but whenever a statute or document is to be construed, it must be construed not according to the mere ordinary general meaning of the words, but according to the ordinary meaning of the words as applied to the subject matter with regard to which they are used, unless there is something which renders it necessary to read them in a sense which is not their ordinary

(*a*) Sup., pp. 28–29.

P. b. 2, s. 16; Puff. L. N. b. 5,

(*b*) *Per Cur.* in *R. v. Hall*, c. 12, s. 3.

1 B. & C. 136; Grot. de B. &

sense in the English language as so applied (a). This is evident enough in the simple case of a word which has two totally different meanings. The Act of Ed. III., for instance, which forbade ecclesiastics to purchase "provisions" at Rome, would be construed as referring to those papal grants of benefices in England which were called by that name, and not to food; when it was seen that the object of the Act was not to prevent ecclesiastics from living in Rome, but to repress papal usurpations (b). The "vagabond" of the Vagrant Act, is not the mere wanderer of strict etymology (c). No one is likely to confound the "piracy" of the high seas with the "piracy" of copyright; or to give, in one branch of the law, the meaning which would belong, in another, to a host of familiar words, such as "accept," "assure," "issue," "settlement." In the Succession Duty Act, which provided that the instalments of duty payable by a successor should cease at his death, except when he was "competent to dispose by will of a continuing interest in the property," the competency intended was obviously not mental sanity or freedom from personal incapacity, but the possession of an estate of inheritance which

(a) *Per Brett M.R. in Lion Præmunire* passed in 1343, Insurance Co. v. Tucker, 12 1353, 1364, 1390, and 1401.

Q. B. D. 190.

(c) *Monck v. Hilton*, 2 Ex.

(b) 1 Bl. Comm. (Ed. 1770) D. 268.

60; Statutes of Provisors or

was capable of disposition by will (*a*). The Gas Works Consolidation Act did not, by calling the debt due for gas, "rent," authorise a distress for the debt under the Bankrupt Act, which regulates the power of distress of a landlord "or other person to whom 'rent' is due" by the bankrupt (*b*). The Mutiny Acts which exempt soldiers from the payment of tolls over "bridges" would not carry the exemption to a steam ferry boat, because it is called a floating bridge (*c*). The enactment which prohibited parish officials from being concerned in contracts for supplying goods, materials or provisions "for the use of the workhouse," meant "for the use of the persons in the workhouse," and therefore did not apply to a contract for the supply of materials for the repair of the building (*d*). This is too plain to need further illustration.

(*a*) 16 & 17 Vict. c. 51, s. 21; *Attorney-General v. Hallett*, 2 H. & N. 368. See also *R. v. Owen*, 15 Q. B. 476. As to a judgment being "final," *Ridsdale v. Clifton*, 2 P. D. 276; *Exp. Moore*, 14 Q. B. D. 627; *Exp. Grimwade*, 17 Q. B. D. 357; *Re Henderson*, 20 Q. B. D. 509; *Onslow v. Inland Revenue*, 25 Q. B. D. 465; *Salaman v. Warner*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 734; *Re Alexander*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 216; *Re Binstead*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 199.

(*b*) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, s. 34; *Exp. Hill*, 6 Ch. D. 63. See *Exp. Harrison*, 13 Q. B. D. 753. As to "tolls" in railway Acts, see the cases collected in the judgment of Field J. in *Brown v. G. W. R. Co.*, 9 Q. B. D. 750. As to a water "rate," see *Badcock v. Hunt*, 22 Q. B. D. 145.

(*c*) *Ward v. Gray*, 6 B. & S. 345.

(*d*) 55 Geo. III. c. 137, s. 6; *Barber v. Waite*, 1 A. & E. 514; comp. 4 & 5 Will. IV. c. 76, s. 77.

In dealing with matters relating to the general public, statutes are presumed to use words in their popular sense; *uti loquitur vulgus* (*a*). But when dealing with particular businesses or transactions, words are presumed to be used with the particular meaning in which they are used and understood in the particular business in question (*b*); that meaning being rejected, however, as soon as the judicial mind is satisfied that another is more agreeable to the object and intention (*c*). Thus, the 38 Geo. III. c. 5 and c. 60, which exempted "hospitals" from the land tax, was construed as applying to all establishments popularly known by that designation, and even as extending to an asylum for orphans (*d*); when it appeared more consonant to the object of the Act to give it that wider meaning, than to restrict it to what are alone "hospitals" in the strict legal sense of the

(*a*) *The Fusilier*, 34 L. J. P. M. & A. 27, *per* Dr. Lushington. See *e. g.* *Pitts v. Millar*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 380.

(*b*) *Per* Lord Esher M.R. in *Unwin v. Harrison*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 119; and in *The Dunelm*, 9 P. D. 171; *Grot. b. 2, c. 16, s. 3*; *Vattel, b. 2, s. 276*; *Evans v. Stevens*, 4 T. R. 462, *per* Lord Kenyon; *Morrall v. Sutton*, 1 Phil. 533; *Doe v. Jesson*, 2 Bligh, 2; *Doe v. Harvey*, 4 B. & C. 610; *Abbot v. Middleton*, 7

H. L. 68; *The Pacific*, 33 L. J. P. M. & A. 120; see *per* James L.J. in *Boucicault v. Chatterton*, 5 Ch. D. 275; *Re Spackman*, 24 Q. B. D. 728; *Re Hughes*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 595.

(*c*) *Per* Lord Wensleydale in *Roddy v. Fitzgerald*, 6 H. L. 877. See also *Towns v. Wentworth*, 11 Moo. 543.

(*d*) *Colchester v. Kewney*, L. R. 2 Ex. 363. See *R. v. Manchester*, 4 B. & Ald. 504.

term, that is, eleemosynary institutions in which the persons benefited form a corporate body (*a*). So the power given in the Highway Act, 1835, to a surveyor to "lop" trees growing near a highway, was construed in the popular sense as confined to cutting off lateral branches, and not extending to "topping" (*b*). An Act which privileged a bankrupt from arrest for "debt" was, on the same principle, extended to arrests for non-payment of money ordered to be paid by an order of the Court of Chancery, or by a rule of a Common Law Court, though technically not constituting a debt (*c*); and the provision of s. 18, sub-s. 8 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, which made a composition binding on creditors as regards any "debts" due to them from the debtor and provable in bank-

- (*a*) *Sutton's Case*, 10 Rep. 31a. *v. Layton*, 4 C. P. D. 130 ;
 (*b*) 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 50, s. *Bates v. Bates*, 14 P. D. 17.
 65 ; *Unwin v. Harrison*, [1891] Comp. also under the stat. of set
 2 Q. B. 115. off, *Remington v. Stevens*, 2 Stra.
 (*c*) *Exp. M'Williams*, 1 Sch. 1271 ; *Francis v. Dodsworth*,
 & Lef. 169 ; *R. v. Edwards*, 9 B. 4 C. B. 220, *per Wilde C.J.* ;
 & C. 652 ; *R. v. Dunne*, 2 M. & *Rawley v. Rawley*, 1 Q. B. D.
 S. 201 ; *Lees v. Newton*, L. R. 460 ; and see *Jones v. Thompson*,
 1 C. P. 658. Comp. *Bancroft v. E. B. & E. 63* ; *Dresser v. Johns*,
Mitchell, L. R. 2 Q. B. 549 ; 6 C. B. N. S. 429 ; *Hall v.*
Drover v. Beyer, 13 Ch. D. *Pritchett*, 3 Q. B. D. 215 ; *Exp.*
 242 ; *Exp. Muirhead*, 2 Ch. D. *Jones*, 18 Ch. D. 109 ; *Marquis*
 22 ; *Exp. Fryer*, 17 Q. B. D. of *Salisbury v. Ray*, 8 C. B. N.
 718 ; *Exp. Sacker*, 22 Q. B. D. S. 193 ; *Re Long*, 20 Q. B. D.
 179 ; *Patterson v. Patterson*, 316 ; *R. v. Paget*, 8 Q. B. D.
 L. R. 2 P. & M. 189 ; *Dolphin* 151.

ruptcy, was held to apply to any contingent liabilities which would be released by an order of discharge (a). The primarily technical term "purchaser," was understood to be used in the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, in the popular sense of buyer (b). So, when it was enacted (5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 54) that marriages already celebrated between persons within prohibited degrees should not be annulled for that cause, unless by sentence pronounced in a suit then "depending"; it was held that this last word was to be understood in a popular and not technical sense, and that a suit was "depending" as soon as the citation had been issued (c); and similarly where under the constitution of an association, originally founded in 1861, there were frequent changes of membership, technically amounting to the formation of partnerships after 1862, it was held that the association was "formed," within the meaning of s. 4 of the Companies Act, 1862, before the passing of the Act, as the expression must be taken in its popular sense (d). An Act which authorised the Court before which a road indictment

(a) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 52; 20 Q. B. D. 732; and see *Re Flint v. Barnard*, 22 Q. B. D. Amos, [1891] 3 Ch. 159.

90; and see *Hardy v. Fothergill*, 13 App. Cas. 351; *Re Craig's Claim*, [1895] 1 Ch. 267.

(b) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, s. 91; *Exp. Hillman*, 10 Ch. D. 622. *Comp. Hance v. Harding*,

(c) *Sherwood v. Ray*, 1 Moo. P. C. 353. See *Ditcher v. Denison*, 11 Moo. P. C. 324; *R. v. Brooks*, 2 C. & K. 402.

(d) 25 & 26 Vict. c. 89, s. 4; *Shaw v. Simmons*, 12 Q. B. D. 117.

was "preferred," to give the prosecutor costs, was held to authorise the judge to give them, who tried the indictment at Nisi Prius after its removal into the Queen's Bench (a); for the technical meaning of the word "preferred," would have rendered the Act nugatory in a large majority of cases, road indictments being rarely tried at the Assizes at which they are "preferred" (b). Where judgment was "recovered" for £500 on a warrant of attorney to secure an annuity of £30, of which only £15 were due, it was held that the defendant was protected from arrest by the enactment that no person should be taken in execution on a judgment "where the sum recovered does not exceed £20." Though technically the judgment was "recovered" for the larger sum, the sum really recovered was under £20 (c). The Railway Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, which, while giving companies power to take land for temporary purposes, provided that they should not be exempted from "an action" for nuisance or other injury, was construed as not limited to what were technically "actions," but included all proceedings whether at law or in equity (d). Where the Quarter Sessions

(a) *R. v. Pembridge*, 3 Q. B. 901; *R. v. Preston*, 7 Dowl. 593; and see *R. v. Papworth*, 2 East, 413; *R. v. Ipstones*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 216.

(b) *Per Coleridge* J. 3 Q. B. 906.

(c) 7 & 8 Vict. c. 96, s. 5; *Johnson v. Harris*, 15 C. B. 357.

(d) 8 Vict. c. 20, s. 32; *Fenwick v. East London R. Co.*, L. R. 20 Eq. 544; and see *Walker v. Clements*, 15 Q. B.

were empowered to order "the party against whom "an appeal was decided," to pay the costs of the successful party; it was held that the prosecutor who had procured the conviction successfully appealed against, was for this purpose the party appealed against, though he was not so on the record, or formally, nor even by being served with notice of the appeal (*a*). The convicting justices were not the parties appealed against, though the Act required that the notice of appeal should be served on them. Even the word "party" has received the sense in which it is sometimes vulgarly used, of "person," when it is plain that Parliament so intended it; as in the Chancery Amendment Act of 1852, which enacted that any "party" who made an affidavit in a suit should be liable to cross-examination (*b*). The 17 Geo. III. c. 26, which, after requiring the registration of annuities, to check, as the preamble states, the pernicious practice of raising money by the sale of life annuities, except annuities charged on lands whereof the grantor is "seised in fee simple or fee "tail in possession," was construed as including in this exception a person who was tenant for life with a general power of appointment; for such a person, though not technically a tenant in fee simple, is sub-

1046; *Rawley v. Rawley*, 1 M. C. 4.

Q. B. D. 460.

(*b*) 15 & 16 Vict. c. 86, s.

(*a*) *R. v. Hants*, 1 B. & Ad. 40; *Re Quartz Hill Co.*, 21 Ch. 654; *R. v. Purdey*, 34 L. J. D. 642.

stantially so, since he is the absolute owner of the property (*a*). Although the word "children" is confined technically to legitimate children (*b*), it would be construed as including illegitimate children, when such seemed to be more consonant to the intention. Thus, the Marriage Act, 26 Geo. II. c. 33, which declared void the marriage of minors without the consent of their parents or guardians, was held to apply to illegitimate children, since clandestine marriages by them were within the mischief which it was the object to remedy (*c*); and the 4 & 5 Ph. & M. c. 8, s. 3, which made it penal to take an unmarried girl under sixteen from the possession of her parents, against their will, was held to apply to the taking of a natural daughter from her putative father (*d*).

In a Customs Act, which imposes duties on imported commodities, the articles specified would generally be understood in their known commercial sense (*e*). Thus, "Bohea" tea was understood to mean, not the pure and unadulterated article to

(*a*) *Halsey v. Hales*, 7 T. R. Q. B. 173; *R. v. Brighton*, 1 194. Comp. *Leach v. Jay*, L. R. B. & S. 447.
9 Ch. D. 42.

(*b*) *R. v. Helton*, Burr. S. C. 1162. See *Dorin v. Dorin*, L. 187; *R. v. Birmingham*, 8 Q. R. 7 H. L. 568; *Dickinson v. B. 410*; *R. v. Maude*, 2 Dowl. N. E. R. Co., 2 H. & C. 735; *N. S. 58*; *Hill v. Crook*, L. R. *Re Wright*, 2 K. & J. 595.
6 H. L. 265.

(*c*) *R. v. Hodnett*, 1 T. R. Ex. 281; *Elliott v. Swartwout*, 10 Peters, 137.
96; and see *R. v. St. Giles*, 11

which the name strictly belongs, and which alone is known by it in China; but all teas usually bought and sold at home as Bohea (*a*). So, to take an illustration from a contract, a fire policy which limited the responsibility of insurers to explosions by "gas," was construed as referring only to that kind of gas which was popularly known by that term, viz., common illuminating gas (*b*).

Where a statute applied to the United Kingdom, and the technical meaning of words differed in the different kingdoms, the language would be taken in its popular sense (*c*).

The words of a statute must be understood in the sense which they bore when it was passed (*d*). For instance, a private Act (6 & 7 Will. IV. c. c. s. 8), which provided that "no action in any of His Majesty's "Courts of Law" should be brought against certain shipowners without a month's notice, has been held not to apply to proceedings in the Admiralty Division of the High Court of Justice; for when the Act was

(*a*) Two hundred chests of tea, 9 Wheat. 430; "Gin," Webb v. Knight, 2 Q. B. D. 530; "Spirits," Atty.-Gen. v. Bailey, 1 Ex. 281.

(*b*) Stanley v. Western Ins. Co., L. R. 3 Ex. 71. See as to covenant not to carry on the business of a "beerhouse," Holt v. Collyer, 16 Ch. D. 718.

(*c*) Saltoun v. Advocate-General, 3 Macq. 659; Macfarlane v. Lord Advocate, [1894] A. C. 307. See, however, Income Tax Commissioners v. Pemsel, [1891] A. C. 531.

(*d*) See *per* Lord Esher M.R. in Gas Light & Coke Co. v. Hardy, 17 Q. B. D. 621; Sharpe v. Wakefield, 22 Q. B. D. 242.

passed, the Admiralty Court was not called, and was not, one of His Majesty's Courts, nor were the proceedings there called an action (*a*).

In a consolidation Act it will be found that the language bears the meaning attached to it in the original enactment. For instance, the provision in the Sheriffs Act, 1887, requiring sheriffs' officers not to take arrested persons to prison for twenty-four hours, applies only to arrests on mesne process or Crown debts, such being the construction given to the original enactment, 32 Geo. II. c. 28 (*b*).

But it is in the interpretation of general words and phrases that the principle of strictly adapting the meaning to the particular subject matter in reference to which the words are used, finds its most frequent application. However wide in the abstract, they are more or less elastic, and admit of restriction or expansion to suit the subject matter. While expressing truly enough all that the Legislature intended, they frequently express more, in their literal meaning and natural force; and it is necessary to give them the meaning which best suits the scope and object of the

(*a*) The Longford, 14 P. D. 34. 14; Mitchell *v.* Simpson, 25
See also St. Cross *v.* Howard, Q. B. D. 183; and see *per* Lord
6 T. R. 338; and see further Watson in Smith *v.* Baker,
Chap. XI, Secs. I. & VI. [1891] A. C. 349; and *per* Lord
How far this applies to new Herschell in Bank of England
things, see p. 109. *v.* Vagliano, [1891] A. C.

(*b*) 50 & 51 Vict. c. 55, s. 144.

statute, without extending to ground foreign to the intention. It is, therefore, a canon of interpretation that all words, if they be general and not express and precise, are to be restricted to the fitness of the matter (*a*). They are to be construed as particular if the intention be particular (*b*); that is, they must be understood as used in reference to the subject matter in the mind of the Legislature, and strictly limited to it.

Thus, enactments which related to "persons" would be variously understood, according to the circumstances under which they were used, as including or not including corporations (*c*); and as limited to persons born in the Queen's allegiance, or as including also all foreigners actually within the British dominions (*d*), or (the meaning in prize and commercial law) only persons domiciled in those dominions (*e*). In an Act which provided for the recovery of wages by "persons belonging to a ship," this expression

(*a*) Bac. Max. 10.

63, s. 19, in all future Acts

(*b*) *Stradling v. Morgan*,
Plowd. 204.

"person" includes any body
corporate or unincorporate.

(*c*) *R. v. Gardner*, Cowp. 79 ;
R. v. York, 6 A. & E. 419 ; *R.*
v. Beverley Gas Co., Id. 645,
Bac. Stat. Uses, 43, 57 ; *Phar-*
maceutical Soc. v. London
Supply Assoc., 5 A. C. 857 ; *St.*
Leonard's v. Franklin, 3 C. P. D.
377. By 52 & 53 Vict. c.

(*d*) *Courteen's Case*, Hob.
270 ; *Nga Hoong v. R.*, 7 Cox,
489 ; *Low v. Routledge*, 35 L.
J. Ch. 117, *per Turner L.J.*

(*e*) *Wilson v. Marryat*, 8
T. R. 31 ; *The Indian Chief*, 3
Rob 12.

would obviously be confined to persons employed in its service on board ; while in one which related to the salvage of "persons belonging to the ship," it would as obviously include passengers as well as crew (*a*). The 13 Eliz. c. 5, which made void, as against creditors, all voluntary alienation of "goods," was held to apply only to such goods as were liable to be taken in execution ; as the object of the Act was to prevent such property from being withdrawn from the reach of creditors : consequently, the word "goods" was held not to include choses in action, as long as these were not subject to execution (*b*). But the same word was held to include them in the reputed ownership clauses of former bankrupt and insolvent Acts (*c*) ; as they were deemed to fall within the specific object of the Legislature, which was to protect creditors against being deceived by an apparent ownership of property. A bungalow constructed of wood and corrugated iron erected on a piece of land for the purpose of exhibition and sale, but not used or occupied, or intended to be used or occupied on the spot on which it was erected, though

- (*a*) *The Fusilier*, 3 Moo. N. A. & E. 536.
 S. 51 ; see *The Cybele*, 3 P. D. (*c*) *Ryall v. Rowles*, 1 Ves.
 8 ; *U. S. v. Winn*, 3 Sumner, 367 ; *Exp. Baldwin*, 2 De G.
 209. & Jo. 230 ; "Insolvency,"
 (*b*) *Dundas v. Dutens*, 1 Ves. comp. *Re Muggridge*, Johns.
 J. 196 ; *Rider v. Kidder*, 10 625 ; and *R. v. Saddlers' Co.*,
 Ves. 360 ; *Norcutt v. Dodd*, Cr. 10 H. L. 404.
 & Ph. 100 ; *Sims v. Thomas*, 12

clearly a "wooden structure or erection of a move-able or temporary character," is not within the meaning of those words as used in s. 13 of the Metropolis Management and Building Acts Amendment Act, 1882, and does not require a license in writing from the County Council for its erection. The Act was not aimed at such a structure (*a*). Damage caused by the mainsail gear of a barge coming in contact with a pile-driving engine fixed on a wharf, as the barge was sailing past, would not be "damage by collision" within the meaning of the County Court Admiralty Jurisdiction Act, 1868 (*b*). So in bankruptcy Acts, the word "creditor" is found to be limited, usually, to persons who are creditors at the time of the bankruptcy and entitled to prove under it (*c*); and the statute which makes it a criminal offence for any member of a "co-partnership" to embezzle the moneys belonging to it, has been held not to apply to the case of an association having for its object, not the acquisition of gain, but the spiritual and mental improvement of its members (*d*).

The complex term "inhabitant" may be cited as having frequently furnished illustration of this adap-

(*a*) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 14; (*c*) *Grace v. Bishop*, 11 Ex. London C.C. *v. Humphreys*, 424; *Re Poland*, L. R. 1 Ch. [1894] 2 Q. B. 755. 356.

(*b*) 31 & 32 Vict. c. 71, s. 3; (*d*) 31 & 32 Vict. c. 116, s. 1; *Robson v. The Kate*, 21 Q. B. D. 13. *R. v. Robson*, 16 Q. B. D. 137.

tation of the meaning to what appears to suit most exactly the object of the Act. In the abstract, the word would include every human being dwelling in the place spoken of. A right of way over a field to the parish church granted to the "inhabitants" of a parish would include every person in the parish (*a*). But where the object of an Act was to impose a pecuniary burden in respect of property in the locality (as in the case of the Statute of Bridges, 22 Hen. VIII. c. 5, which throws the burden of making and repairing bridges on the "inhabitants" of the town or county in which they are situated, and in the Riot and Black Acts (*b*)), the expression would be construed as comprising all holders of lands or houses in the locality, whether resident or not, and corporate bodies as well as individuals, but as excluding actual dwellers who had no rateable property in the place, such as servants; it being "infinite and impossible" to tax every inhabitant being no householder, and who could not be distrained upon for non-payment, and therefore highly improbable that the Legislature intended to tax them (*c*).

On the other hand, where the object is to impose the performance of a personal service within the locality,

(*a*) *R. v. Mashiter*, 6 A. & E. 165, *per* Littledale J.

(*b*) *R. v. North Curry*, 4 B. & C. 958, *per* Bayley J.

(*c*) 2 Inst. 702; *R. v. North Curry*, 4 B. & C. 958, *per* Bayley J.

the word "inhabitant" would probably be construed as not comprising either corporate bodies or non-resident proprietors. Thus, it was held that a person who occupied premises in one parish and carried on his business in person there, but resided in his dwelling-house in another, was not an "inhabitant" of the former parish so as to be bound to serve as its constable (a). So, an Act which authorised the imposition of a rate on all who "inhabited or occupied" any land or house, and the appointment of a number of "inhabitants" to collect the rates, was held to throw the latter duty only on actual dwellers in the locality (b). But here the word "occupied" would suggest a meaning for "inhabitants" distinct from "occupiers."

Again, another meaning would be given to the same expression, where the object was to determine the settlement of a pauper, or the qualification of an elector. In those cases, a person is an inhabitant or resident of the place in which he usually sleeps (c). What amounts to inhabitancy in this sense, it is impossible to define. Sleeping in a place once or twice does not constitute it; and, on the other hand, such

(a) *R. v. Adlard*, 4 B. & C. Stra. 60, *per* Parker C.J.; *R. v. 772*; and see *R. v. Nicholson*, Charles, Burr. Set. C. 706; *R. 12 East*, 330; *Williams v. Jones*, *v. Stratford*, 11 East, 176; *R. Id.* 346. *v. Mildenhall*, 3 B. & Ald. 374;

(b) *Donne v. Martyr*, 8 B. & Beal *v. Ford*, 3 C. P. D. 73; *C. 62.* *Ford v. Drew*, 5 C. P. D. 59;

(c) *St. Mary v. Radcliffe*, 1 *Riley v. Read*, 4 Ex. D. 100.

residence generally in a place, in this sense, is quite compatible with much absence from it (*a*). But if an Act requires residence for a certain time at least, as a qualification, it would be understood to make actual bodily presence in the place for that time indispensable ; as was held in the construction of the Act which constituted the congregation of the University of Oxford, of residents ; and required that those residents should have resided at least twenty weeks in a year (*b*).

The same expression has received another meaning where the object of the Act was to preserve information as to the place where a person was to be found at times when it was most likely that he should be sought ; as in the enactment which requires an attorney to indorse his "place of abode" on the summons which he issues ; or a witness to a bill of sale, to add to his signature a description of his occupation and "residence." In these cases it has been held, considering the object which the Legislature had in view,

- (*a*) *R. v. Mitchell*, 10 East, 518 ; *Wescomb's Case*, L. R. 4 Q. B. 110 ; *Taylor v. St. Mary Abbots*, L. R. 5 C. P. 309 ; *Bond v. St. George's*, 6 Id. 312 ; and see *Whitehorne v. Thomas*, 7 M. & Gr. 1 ; *Ford v. Pye*, L. R. 9 C. P. 269 ; *Ford v. Hart*, Id. 273 ; *McDougal v. Paterson*, 11 C. B. 755 ; *Dunston v. Paterson*, 5 C. B. N. S. 267 ; *Powell v. Guest*, 34 L. J. C. P. 69 ; *Spittall v. Brook*, 18 Q. B. D. 426 ; *Beal v. Town Clerk of Exeter*, 20 Q. B. D. 300 ; *Donoghue v. Brook*, 57 L. J. Q. B. 122.
- (*b*) *R. v. Oxford (V.C.)*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 471.

that the place of business was the abode or residence intended (a). But in general the place of business of a person would not be regarded as his "place of abode" (b). It has been held to be his "address" as a witness to a bill of sale under the Bills of Sale Act, 1882 (c); but not to be his "address" for indorsement on a writ as plaintiff in an action (d).

A clerk or servant does not "carry on business" in the place where he is employed, within the meaning of Acts giving jurisdiction to County and other Courts over persons who dwell or carry on business within their limits (e); but the words would receive a wider meaning when the object of the enactment had reference to the distribution of business between different Bankruptcy Courts (f).

Under the provisions of the County Courts Act, which gave the Superior Courts concurrent jurisdiction when the parties dwelt more than twenty miles apart, the principal office of a railway company was its

- | | |
|---|---|
| (a) <i>Roberts v. Williams</i> , 2 C. M. & R. 561; <i>Blackwell v. England</i> , 27 L. J. Q. B. 124; | (b) See <i>R. v. Hammond</i> , 17 Q. B. 772. |
| <i>Attenborough v. Thompson</i> , 27 L. J. Ex. 23; <i>Ablett v. Basham</i> , 25 L. J. Q. B. 239; <i>Hewer v. Cox</i> , 30 L. J. Q. B. 73; <i>Larchin v. N. W. Bank</i> , L. R. 10 Ex. 64, <i>per Blackburn J.</i> See | (c) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 43, <i>Simmons v. Woodward</i> , [1892] A. C. 100. |
| <i>Thorp v. Browne</i> , L. R. 2 H. L. 220. | (d) Rules of S. C. 1883, Order IV. r. 1; <i>Stoy v. Rees</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 748. |
| | (e) <i>Graham v. Lewis</i> , 22 Q. B. D. 1. |
| | (f) <i>Exp. Breull</i> , 16 Ch. D. 484. |

dwelling (a); but not its other offices or stations (b). But the manufactory or shop, where the business is substantially carried on, and not its registered office, is the dwelling, within the meaning of the same provision, of a manufacturing company (c). For fiscal purposes, a corporation is regarded as residing where the governing body carries on the supreme management, though the scene of its operations and sources of profit, and even the majority of the shareholders, are out of the country, and though it has a foreign domicile and is registered abroad (d). A foreign corporation which had any establishment in this country would for the same purpose be considered as resident here, as regards the question of jurisdiction (e).

In the same way, the word "occupier" has received different meanings, varying with the object of the enactment. Ordinarily, the tenant of premises is the "occupier" of them, although he may be personally absent from them (f); while a servant or an officer

- | | |
|---|--|
| (a) <i>Adams v. Gt. Western R. Co.</i> , 6 H. & N. 404; <i>Taylor v. Crowland Gas Co.</i> , 11 Ex. 1; <i>Minor v. N. W. R. Co.</i> , 1 C. B. N. S. 325. | B. 44. |
| (b) <i>Shiels v. G. N. R. Co.</i> , 30 L. J. Q. B. 331; <i>Brown v. London and N. W. R. Co.</i> , 4 B. & S. 326. | (d) <i>Newby v. Colt's Arms Co.</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 293; <i>Haggin v. Comptoir d'Escompte</i> , 23 Q. B. D. 519; <i>Carron Iron Co. v. Maclaren</i> , 5 H. L. 459. See <i>Atty.-Gen. v. Alexander</i> , L. R. 10 Ex. 20. |
| (c) <i>Keynsham v. Baker</i> , 2 H. & C. 729; see also <i>Aberystwith Pier Co. v. Cooper</i> , 35 L. J. Q. | (e) <i>Cesena Sulphur Co. v. Nicholson</i> , 1 Ex. D. 428. |
| | (f) <i>R. v. Poynder</i> , 1 B. & C. 178. |

who is in actual occupation of premises, *virtute officii*, would not be an "occupier" (a). But in the Bill of Sales Act of 1854, which provided that personal chattels should be deemed in the possession of the grantor of a bill of sale so long as they were on the premises "occupied" by him, actual personal occupation, and not merely tenancy, was intended; and therefore the owner of chattels in rooms which he did not personally occupy was not in the apparent possession of them, within that Act (b).

This restriction of meaning may be carried still further to promote the real intention, and not exceed the object and scope of the enactment. Thus, an Act which, reciting the inconveniences arising from churchwardens and overseers making clandestine rates, enacted that those officers should permit "every inhabitant" of the parish to inspect the rates, under a penalty for refusal, was held not to apply to a refusal to one of the churchwardens, who was also an inhabi-

(a) *Clark v. Bury St. Edmunds*, 1 C. B. N. S. 23; *Bent v. Roberts*, 3 Ex. D. 66; *R. v. Spurrell*, L. R. 1 Q. B. 72; *McClellan v. Prichard*, 20 Q. B. D. 285.

(b) 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36; *Robinson v. Briggs*, L. R. 6 Ex. 1. As to the word "traveller," see *Taylor v. Humphreys*, 10 C. B. N. S. 429; *Fisher v. Howard*, 34 L. J. M. C. 42; *Atkinson v. Sellers*, 5 C. B. N. S. 442; *Saunders v. S. E. R. Co.*, 5 Q. B. D. 456; *Penn v. Alexander*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 522; "Lodger" and "occupier," *Bradley v. Baylis*, 8 Q. B. D. 195, 210; *Morton v. Palmer*, 51 L. J. Q. B. 7; *Heawood v. Bone*, 13 Q. B. D. 179.

tant. As the object of the Act was limited to the protection of those inhabitants only who had previously no access to the rates (which the churchwardens had), the meaning of the term "inhabitants" was limited to them (*a*).

In another case, the majority of the Judges of the Queen's Bench went further than the Chief Justice thought legitimate, in giving an unusual and even artificial meaning to a word, for the purpose of keeping within the apparent scope of the Act. The treaty between Great Britain and the United States of 1842 and the 6 & 7 Vict. c. 76, passed to give the Executive the necessary powers for carrying its provisions into effect, having provided that each State should, on the requisition of the other, deliver up to justice all persons who, being charged with murder, "piracy," or other crimes therein mentioned, committed within the jurisdiction of either State, should seek an asylum, or be found within the territories of the other; it was held that the word "piracy" was confined to those acts which are declared piracy by the municipal law of either country, such as slave-trading, and did not include those which are piracy in the ordinary and primary sense of the word, that is, *jure gentium*: for as the latter offence was within the jurisdiction of all States, and was triable by all, and the offenders could not, consequently, be said to seek an asylum in any

(*a*) *Wethered v. Calcutt*, 5 *Mashiter*, 6 A. & E. 153, Scott N. R. 409; see also *R. v.*

State, since none could be a place of safety for them, that species of the crime was not within the mischief intended to be remedied by the treaty or the Act (*a*).

SECTION II.—BENEFICIAL CONSTRUCTION.

It is said to be the duty of the judge to make such construction of a statute as shall suppress the mischief and advance the remedy (*b*). Even where the usual meaning of the language falls short of the whole object of the Legislature, a more extended meaning may be attributed to it, if fairly susceptible of it. If there are circumstances in the Act showing that words are used in a larger sense than their ordinary meaning, that sense must be given to them (*c*). Thus the enactment (25 & 26 Vict. c. 63, s. 54, sub-s. 4) limiting the liability of shipowners where, among other things, the injury done is “by reason of the improper navigation” of their ships, extends to a case where a collision was owing, not to any default of the crew, but to the breakdown of the steering gear from the negligence of engineers on

(*a*) *Re Ternan*, 33 L. J. M. Cockburn C.J. in *Twycross v. C.* 201. See also *Kwok Ah Grant*, 2 C. P. D. 530. See *Sing v. Atty.-Gen.*, 5 P. C. e. g. *Re Dick*, [1891] 1 Ch. 179. 426.

(*b*) *Heydon's Case*, 3 Rep. 7b. (*c*) *Per Lord Esher M.R.* in *Per Lord Kenyon in Turtle v. Barlow v. Ross*, 24 Q. B. D. Hartwell, 6 T. R. 429; *per* 389.

shore, who had improperly fixed it (*a*). It would extend to every case where the negligence is that of any person for whose negligence the owner is responsible, unless it occurred with the privity of the latter (*b*). To supply beer at a public-house to a drunken man, would be to "sell" the liquor to him, although it was ordered and paid for by a sober companion (*c*). Acts which gave a "single woman" who had a bastard child the right to sue the putative father for its maintenance have been held to include in that expression, not only a widow (*d*), but a married woman living apart from her husband (*e*); for, the general object of the Act being to compel men to contribute to the support of their illegitimate offspring, even a married woman living under circumstances incompatible with marital access, though not in popular language a single woman, is nevertheless, for the purposes of the Act, and therefore in the contemplation of the Legislature, as "single" as a woman who has no husband. So where by s. 141 of the Army Act, 1881, assignments of or charges

(*a*) *The Warkworth*, 9 P. D. 145.

(*b*) *Id.* per Brett M.R.

(*c*) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94, s. 13; *Scatchard v. Johnson*, 57 L. J. M. C. 41.

(*d*) *Antony v. Cardenham*, 2 Bott, p. 194; *R. v. Wymondham*, 2 Q. B. 541.

(*e*) *R. v. Pilkington*, 2 E. & B. 546, S. C. nom. Exp. Grimes, 22 L. J. M. C. 153; *R. v. Collingwood*, 12 Q. B. 681; *R. v. Luffe*, 8 East, 193. *Comp. Stacey v. Lintell*, 4 Q. B. D. 291; and see *Croydon Union v. Reigate Union*, 14 App. Cas. 465.

upon pensions received by officers in respect of past services are forbidden, but nothing is said in terms about executions or attachments, it has been held that these must be regarded as included; as otherwise the object to be effected, viz., to secure a provision which should keep the pensioners from want, and enable them to keep a respectable social position, would be frustrated (*a*). The authority given by the Municipal Corporations Act to expend the local funds upon "corporate buildings" was construed as extending to the cost of lining the corporation pew in the church (*b*). Dogs (*c*), and shares in a limited company (*d*), have, by a beneficial construction, been held to be "goods" within the meaning of that word as used in certain statutes; while on the other hand, a linen bag has been decided not to be a "case" in which gunpowder may be carried, for the purpose of satisfying the requirement of the Metalliferous Mines Act, 1872, that explosives shall not be taken into a mine except in a "case or canister," as such a case would not effect the object of the statute of affording protection against ignition from sparks (*e*). On similar grounds the

(*a*) 44 & 45 Vict. c. 58; Lucas
v. Harris, 18 Q. B. D. 127.

(*b*) 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 76;

R. v. Warwick, 8 Q. B. 926.

(*c*) 2 & 3 Vict. c. 71, s. 40;

R. v. Slade, 21 Q. B. D. 433.

(*d*) R. S. C. 1883, Order L.
r. 2; *Evans v. Davies*, [1893]

2 Ch. 216.

(*e*) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 77, s.

23; *Foster v. Diphwys Casson*
Slate Co., 18 Q. B. D. 429.

enactment in the Artizans' Dwellings Act, 1875, which, after authorising local authorities to purchase land for such dwellings, provides that all rights or easements relating to the purchased land should be extinguished, but compensated for, has been held to include under the word "rights," inchoate as well as complete rights (*a*). An Act which required a railway company to make, for the accommodation of the owners and occupiers of the adjacent lands, sufficient fences for protecting the lands from trespass, and the cattle of the owners and occupiers from straying thereout, was held to include in the term "occupier" a person who merely had put his cattle on land with the license of the occupier (*b*). And the same word, even when coupled with "owner" (*c*), has been construed, with the view of promoting the object of the enactment and reaching the mischief aimed at, as including a person standing on a spot in a park or place, where he had no more right to stand than any other person (*d*). So it has been held that cows agisted on the terms that the agister should take their milk in exchange for their pasturage, were taken in to be fed at a "fair

(*a*) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 36, s. 20; *Barlow v. Ross*, 24 Q. B. D. 381. Comp. *Hawkins v. Rutter*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 668, where "easement" was construed in its strictest sense. Co., L. R. 8 Ex. 8; and see *Kittow v. Liskeard*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 7.

(*c*) See Chap. XI, Sec. IV.

(*d*) See *Doggett v. Cattermole*, 34 L. J. C. P. 46; *Bows v. Fenwick*, L. R. 9 C. P. 339.

(*b*) *Dawson v. Midland R.*

“price” (*a*), that an agreement by a shareholder with a company to set off a present liability of the company to pay cash to him against future calls on his shares was a payment of the calls “in cash” (*b*), that the attendance of an uncertificated midwife at the confinement of the wife of an elector, who was sent to her and paid for by the relieving officer, was “medical assistance,” so that the relief afforded did not disqualify the elector from being registered (*c*); and that an ante-nuptial agreement for a marriage settlement was a “marriage settlement” (*d*). A statute which requires a railway company to keep in repair a “bridge” carrying a highway over their lines, requires them also to maintain the roadway upon the bridge (*e*). A fishing-boat of ten tons provided with masts, which unshipped, and sails used for going to sea, but which was propelled by four oars in harbour and shallow water, was decided to be “a ship” within the

(*a*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 61, s. 45; *London & Yorks. Bank v. Belton*, 15 Q. B. D. 457.

(*b*) 30 & 31 Vict. c. 131, s. 25; *Re Jones Lloyd & Co.*, 41 Ch. D. 159.

(*c*) 48 & 49 Vict. c. 46, s. 2; *Honeybone v. Hambridge*, 18 Q. B. D. 418.

(*d*) 41 & 42 Vict. c. 31, s. 4; *Wenman v. Lyon & Co.*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 192; and see *Re Vansittart*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 181.

(*e*) 8 & 9 Vict. c. 20, s. 46; *Mayor of Bury v. Lancashire and Yorks. Ry.*, 14 A. C. 417.

See also as to a “book” within 5 & 6 Vict. c. 45, s. 2, *Maple & Co. v. Junior A. & N. Stores*, 21 Ch. D. 369; *Cable v. Marks*, 52 L. J. Ch. 107; *Davis v. Comitti*, 54 L. J. Ch. 419.

And as to a “boiler” within 45 & 46 Vict. c. 22, *R. v. Boiler Explosion Commissioners*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 703.

Merchant Shipping Act of 1862, which provides that when a collision between two "ships" takes place, the master of each ship is bound to render assistance to the other, on pain of the cancellation or suspension of his certificate. Though the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, s. 2, enacted that the term "ship" should "have the meaning" thereby "assigned" to it, viz., that it should "include every description of vessel "used in navigation not propelled by oars," this was considered not to be a definition, and as not excluding vessels which it did not include (a). On the other hand, a steam launch used for the purpose of carrying passengers on pleasure trips round an artificial lake has been held not to be a "vessel used in navigation," so as to need the suspension on board of a Board of Trade certificate (b).

A debtor residing abroad "keeps out of the way to "avoid service" of process, within the meaning of the Bankruptcy Rules for substituted service (c), and under s. 15 of the Friendly Societies Act, 1875, which provides that registered friendly societies shall

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(a) <i>In re Fergusson</i>, L. R. 6 Q. B. 280. <i>Comp. The Mac</i>, 7 P. D. 126; <i>Gapp v. Bond</i>, 19 Q. B. D. 200; <i>Clyde Navigation v. Laird</i>, 8 App. Cas. 658. And see <i>R. v. Bowyer</i>, per Patteson J., 4 C. & P. 559. See 36 & 37 Vict. c. 85, s. 16.</p> | <p>(b) 17 & 18 Vict. c. 104, ss. 2, 318; <i>Mayor of Southport v. Morris</i>, [1893] 1 Q. B. 359; and see <i>Salt Union v. Wood</i>, [1893] 1 Q. B. 370.</p> <p>(c) Bankruptcy Rules, 1886, rule 154; <i>Re Urquhart</i>, 24 Q. B. D. 723.</p> |
|--|--|

be entitled to the privilege of having "any money or "property belonging to the society," which shall be in the possession of any officer of the society upon his bankruptcy, handed over to the society in preference to any other debts or claims against his estate, it has been held that the society is entitled to be paid out of such estate any balance due to it, in respect of monies received by him for it, even though he has not in his possession those monies in specie, and they cannot be traced (a).

The statutes which require notice of action for anything "done" under them are construed as including an omission of an act which ought to be done as well as the commission of a wrongful one (b). Even criminal statutes, which are subject to the strictest construction, will be found to furnish abundant illustrations of giving an extended meaning to a word (c).

A statute which requires something to be done by a person would, except in cases subject to the principle that *delegatus non potest delegare*, be complied with, in general, if the thing were done by another for him

(a) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 60, s. 15(7);
Re Miller, [1893] 1 Q. B. 327.

(b) *Wilson v. Halifax*, L. R. 3 Ex. 114; *Poulsum v. Thirst*, L. R. 2 C. P. 449; see also *Davis v. Curling*, 8 Q. B. 286; *Newton v. Ellis*, 5 E. & B. 115; *Edwards v. Islington*, 22 Q. B. D. 338.

(c) See Chap. X. As to appeal in a "criminal cause or matter," see *Exp. Woodhall*, 20 Q. B. D. 832; *Exp. Schofield*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 428; *R. v. Tyler*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 588; *Exp. Pulbrook*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 87.

and by his authority; for it would be presumed that there was no intention to prevent the application of the general principle of law that *qui facit per alium facit per se*; unless there was something either in the language or in the object of the statute which showed that a personal act was intended. On this ground, an Act of Parliament which requires that notice of appeal shall be given by churchwardens is complied with if given by their attorney (*a*). So in the absence of any provision to the contrary in the Bills of Sale Acts, it has been held that a bill of sale may be executed by attorney, and the grantee may be the attorney of the grantor for such purpose (*b*). And the Dramatic Copyright Act, 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 15, which requires the written consent of the author of a drama to its representation, would be sufficiently complied with if the consent were given by the author's agent (*c*). When an Irish statute, after giving to tenants for lives, or for more than fourteen years, the

(*a*) *R. v. Middlesex*, 1 L. M. & P. 621; *R. v. Carew*, 20 L. J. M. C. 44n.; *R. v. Kent*, L. R. 8 Q. B. 315; *France v. Dutton*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 208. See other instances in *R. v. St. Mary Abbots*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 378; *Walsh v. Southwell*, 20 L. J. M. C. 165; *R. v. Huntingdonshire*, 1 L. M. & P. 78; *Charles v. Blackwell*, 2 C. P. D. 151; *Re Lancaster*, 3

Ch. D. 498; *Nicholson v. Hood*, 9 M. & W. 365; *Brooker v. Wood*, 5 B. & Ad. 1052; *Jory v. Orchard*, 2 B. & P. 39; *Philps v. Winchcomb*, 3 Bulstr. 77. *Comp. Hider v. Dorrell*, 1 Taunt. 383.

(*b*) *Furnivall v. Hudson*, [1892] 1 Ch. 335.

(*c*) *Morton v. Copeland*, 16 C. B. 517.

right of felling any trees which they had planted, required that "the tenant so planting" them should file an affidavit within twelve months, in a form given by the Act, which purported throughout to be made by the tenant personally, the House of Lords construed the Act as satisfied by the affidavit of the tenant's agent. A stricter construction, it was said, would have rendered the Act inapplicable to most of the cases which it had in view (a).

The principle is well illustrated by two decisions under the 6 & 7 Vict. c. 18, which required that the person who objected to a voter should sign a notice of his objection, and deliver it to the postmaster. This was held to require personal signature, but not personal delivery or receipt. It was material that the person objected to should be able to ascertain that he really was objected to by the objector, which he could not so easily do if a signature by an agent was admitted; just as, to guard against personation, the signature of a voting paper under the former Municipal Corporations Act must be personal and not by agent (b). But there was no valid reason for supposing that the Legislature did not intend to give effect to the rule *qui facit per alium facit per se*, in the case of the mere delivery (c). The knowledge of the servant

(a) *Mountcashel v. O'Neil*, 5 and see *Monks v. Jackson*, 1 H. L. 937. C. P. D. 683.

(b) 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 76, s. (c) *Cuming v. Toms*, 7 M. & 32; *R. v. Tart*, 1 E. & E. 618; Gr. 29 and 88.

may be constructively that of the master within the meaning of an Act, even when making the master penally responsible (*a*). An Act (18 & 19 Vict. c. 121) which authorises justices to summon a person by whose act a nuisance arises, or, if that person cannot be ascertained, the occupier of the premises in which it exists, was held to authorise the summoning of the occupier, if the person who had actually done the act was his servant, since in law the act of the latter is that of the former (*b*).

On the same principle it has been held that s. 3 of the Truck Act, 1831, which provides that the entire amount of wages earned by any artificer shall be actually paid to him in the current coin of the realm, would be satisfied by payment being made to his authorised agent (*c*).

On the other hand, Lord Tenterden's Act, 9 Geo. IV., which requires an acknowledgment "signed by the party chargeable thereby," to take a debt out of the Statute of Limitations, has been held to require personal signature, and not to admit of a signature by an agent (*d*). But this construction was based partly

- | | |
|---|---|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Core v. James</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 135, <i>per</i> Lush J. (but see <i>Pain v. Boughtwood</i> , 24 Q. B. D. 353); <i>R. v. Stephens</i> , L. R. 1 Q. B. 702. | <i>Hewlett v. Allen & Sons</i> , [1894] A. C. 383. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Barnes v. Akroyd</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 474. | (<i>d</i>) <i>Hyde v. Johnson</i> , 2 Bing. N. C. 778. See also <i>Swift v. Jewsbury</i> , L. R. 9 Q. B. 301; |
| | <i>Williams v. Mason</i> , 28 L. T. N. S. 232; <i>Barwick v. English J. S. Bank</i> , L. R. 2 Ex. 259. |
| (<i>c</i>) 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 37; | |

on the circumstance that another Statute of Limitations made express mention of an agent (*a*). Where an Act required that notices should be signed by certain public trustees, or by their clerk, it was held that the signature of the clerk of their clerk, who had a general authority from his employer to sign all documents issuing from his office, was not a compliance with the Act (*b*). And a lithographic indorsement of a solicitor's name is not a compliance with the provision of the C. C. Rules, 1889, that he "shall indorse on the particulars his name or "firm" (*c*).

Again, where the statute required that the act should be done by the party "himself," it would hardly admit of its being done by an agent, as in the case of the provision that a nomination paper of a candidate for municipal office should be delivered to the town clerk by the candidate himself, or his proposer or seconder (*d*). A statute which provides that a person, not a party to an election petition, who is charged with corrupt practices, shall have an opportunity of being heard "by himself" and of calling witnesses, does not authorise his appearing by counsel

(*a*) Sup., p 52.

24 Q. B. D. 533, Lord Esher

(*b*) *Miles v. Bough*, 3 Q. B.

M.R. dissenting.

845. Comp., however, *Brown v. Tombs*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 253.

(*d*) *Monks v. Jackson*, 1 C. P. D. 683. The Munic. Corp.

(*c*) Order VI. r. 10; so held *per* Fry L.J. in *R. v. Cowper*,

Act, 1882, omits "himself"; see 3rd Schedule, part 2, s. 7.

or solicitor (a). So where an Act required a special qualification for doing anything. Thus under the Pharmacy Act, 1868, which forbids under a penalty the sale of poisons by unqualified persons, the shopman of a qualified employer, if not qualified, would be liable to a penalty for selling, except under the personal supervision of his employer (b).

The statute which enacts that in any contract for letting a house for habitation by persons of the working classes there shall be an implied "condition" that the house is fit for habitation, has been construed as importing a promise by the landlord to that effect, and so giving the tenant a right to sue on it, for the purpose of giving effect to the intention (c).

Sometimes the governing principle of the remedial enactment has been extended to cases not included in its language, to prevent a failure of justice, and consequently of the probable intention. Thus, the Common Law Procedure Act of 1854, s. 50, which empowered a Court, upon the application of either party to a cause, supported by the affidavit of such party, of his belief that a material document was in the possession of his opponent, to order its production, though it

(a) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 51, s. 38; *R. v. Mansel Jones*, 23 Q. B. D. 29. and see *Lewis v. Weston* Loc. Bd., 40 Ch. D. 55.
 (c) 48 & 49 Vict. c. 72, s. 12; *Walker v. Hobbs & Co.*, 23 Q. B. D. 458.
 (b) 31 & 32 Vict. c. 121, s. 15; *Pharmaceutical Soc. v. Wheeldon*, 24 Q. B. D. 683;

did not admit the affidavit of the attorney of the party, even when the latter was abroad (*a*), was satisfied by the attorney's affidavit, where the party was a corporation, and consequently incapable of making an affidavit, or, perhaps, of forming a belief (*b*). The governing principle was that all suitors should have power of getting discovery (*c*); and as a corporation could make no affidavit, or could make one only by their attorney, the affidavit of the latter was considered a substantial compliance with the Act.

A provision of the 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 42, which, after depriving the parties to a reference under a rule of Court or judge's order of the power which they formerly had of revoking the authority of their arbitrator, enacted that a judge might from time to time enlarge the time for the arbitrator to make his award, was at first thought confined to cases where a revocation had been attempted (*d*); or, at all events, applicable only where the arbitrator had no power to enlarge the time, or had not yet made his award (*e*); but it was afterwards held that a judge had power to enlarge the time in all references made by judicial order (*f*); and to do so even after the arbitrator had

- | | |
|---|---|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Christopherson v. Lotinga</i> , | M. & R. 742. |
| 15 C. B. N. S. 809; <i>Herschfeld</i> | (<i>e</i>) <i>Per Tindal C.J. in Lambert v. Hutchinson</i> , 2 M. & Gr. |
| <i>v. Clarke</i> , 11 Ex. 712. | 858, and <i>per Patteson J. in Doe</i> |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Kingsford v. G. W. R.</i> | <i>v. Powell</i> , 7 Dowl. 539. |
| Co., 16 C. B. N. S. 761. | (<i>f</i>) <i>Leslie v. Richardson</i> , 6 |
| (<i>c</i>) <i>Per Erle C.J., Id.</i> | |
| (<i>d</i>) <i>Potter v. Newman</i> , 2 C. | C. B. 378. |

issued his award after the time to which he was limited had expired, and the award was consequently, so far, a nullity (*a*).

The beneficial spirit of construction is also well illustrated by cases where there is so far a conflict between the general enactment and some of its subsidiary provisions, that the former would be limited in the scope of its operation if the latter were not restricted. An Act which, after authorising the imposition of a local rate on all occupiers of land in a parish, gives a dissatisfied ratepayer an appeal, but at the same time requires the appellant to enter into recognizances to prosecute the appeal, presents such a conflict. Either it excludes corporations from the right of appeal, because a corporation is incapable of entering into recognizances; or it extends the right to them, without compliance with that special exigency. And the latter would be unquestionably the beneficial way of interpreting the statute. The general and paramount object of the Act would receive full effect by giving to corporate bodies the same right of appeal against the burthen imposed on them; and the subsidiary provision would be understood as applicable only to those who were capable of entering into recognizances (*b*).

The Mortmain Act (9 Geo. II. c. 36), which pro-

(*a*) *Browne v. Collyer*, 2 L. 53; *Lord v. Lee*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 404.
M. & P. 470; *Ward v. Sec. of* (b) *Cortis v. Kent Water-*
State for War, 32 L. J. Q. B. works, 7 B. & C. 314.

hibited the disposition of lands to a charity by other means than by a deed executed a year before the donor's death, was open to the construction that it applied only to lands which passed by deed, and therefore not to lands of copyhold tenure (*a*). But as the object of the statute was, manifestly, to include all lands of whatever tenure in its prohibition, the only consequence that would have followed, if it had been thought impossible that the mode of conveyance provided by the statute should operate to transfer copyholds, would have been that copyholds would have fallen within the general prohibition absolutely, and would have been incapable of passing to a charity by any mode of conveyance (*b*).

Except in some cases where a statute has fallen under the principle of excessively strict construction, the language of a statute is generally extended to new things which were not known and could not have been contemplated by the Legislature when it was passed. This occurs when the Act deals with a genus, and the thing which afterwards comes into existence is a species of it (*c*). Thus, the provision of Magna Charta which exempts lords from the liability of having their carts taken for carriage was held to

(*a*) *Comp. Smith v. Adams*,
sup., p. 41.

(*b*) *Per Lord Tenterden in*
Doe v. Waterton, 3 B. & Ald.
151.

(*c*) *Per Bovill C.J. in R. v.*
Smith, L. R. 1 C. C. 270; *per*
Holt C.J. in Lane v. Cotton,
12 Mod. 485.

extend to degrees of nobility not known when it was made, as dukes, marquises, and viscounts (*a*). The 17 Geo. II. (A.D. 1744), which gave parishioners the right of inspecting the accounts of churchwardens and overseers under the poor law of Elizabeth, was held to extend to those of guardians, officers who were created by Gilbert's Act (22 Geo. III.), passed in 1783 (*b*). The 13 Eliz. c. 5, which made void, as against creditors, transfers of lands, goods, and chattels, did not originally apply to copyholds or choses in action, as these were not seizable in execution (*c*); but when they were made subject to be so taken (1 & 2 Vict. c. 110), they fell within the operation of the Act (*d*). The Act of Geo. II., which protects copyright in engravings by a penalty for piratically engraving, etching, or otherwise, or "in any other manner" copying them, extends to copies taken by the recent invention of photography (*e*).

(*a*) 2 Inst. 35.

(*e*) *Gambart v. Ball*, 14 C.

(*b*) 17 Geo. II. c. 38; 22 Geo. III. c. 83; *R. v. Great Farringdon*, 9 B. & C. 541; *Bennett v. Edwards*, 7 B. & C. 586; 6 Bing. 230.

B. N. S. 306; *Graves v. Ashford*, L. R. 2 C. P. 410; *Atty.-Gen. v. Lockwood*, 9 M. & W. 378; comp. *Hanfstaengl v. Empire Palace*, [1894] 2 Ch. 1;

(*c*) *Sims v. Thomas*, 12 A. & E. 536.

Id. v. Newnes, [1894] 3 Ch. 109. See other instances, *Re*

(*d*) *Norcutt v. Dodd*, Cr. & Ph. 100; *Barrack v. McCulloch*, 26 L. J. Ch. 105; *R. v. Smith*, L. R. 1 C. C. 270; *per Bovill C.J.*

Taylor, 10 Sim. 291; *Exp. Arrowsmith*, 8 Ch. D. 96; and cases cited *infra*, Chap. X, Sec. I.

The telephone is a "telegraph" within the meaning of the Telegraph Acts, 1863 and 1869, though not invented or contemplated in 1869 (a).

It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that beneficial construction is not to be strained so as to include cases plainly omitted from the natural meaning of the words (b). For instance, an Act which requires that public-houses shall be closed at certain hours on Sundays, cannot be construed as extending to Christmas Day (c); and the statutory rule which directs that application for new trials in cases tried by a jury should be made to the Court of Appeal, cannot extend to cases tried by an official referee (d).

(a) 26 & 27 Vict. c. 112; 32 & 33 Vict. c. 73; Atty.-Gen. v. Edison Telephone Co., 6 Q. B. D. 244.

(b) *Supra*, p. 18.

(c) 44 & 45 Vict. c. 61, s. 1; *Forsdike v. Colquhoun*, 11 Q. B. D. 71.

(d) 53 & 54 Vict. c. 44, s. 1; *Gower v. Tobitt*, 39 W. R. 193.

CHAPTER III.

SECTION I.—CONSEQUENCES TO BE CONSIDERED—PRESUMPTION AGAINST ANY ALTERATION OF THE LAW BEYOND THE SPECIFIC OBJECT OF THE ACT.

BEFORE adopting any proposed construction of a passage susceptible of more than one meaning, it is important to consider the effects or consequences which would result from it (*a*), for they often point out the real meaning of the words (*b*). There are certain objects which the Legislature is presumed not to intend; and a construction which would lead to any of them is therefore to be avoided. It is found in such cases sometimes necessary to limit the effect of the words, especially general words, sometimes to depart, not only from their primary and literal meaning, but also from the rules of grammatical construction, whenever it is improbable that they express the real intention of the Legislature; it being more reasonable to hold that the Legislature expressed its intention in a slovenly manner, than that it intended something which it is presumed not to intend.

- (*a*) Grot. de B. & P. b. 2, c. Cranch, 390, *per* Cur.
16, s. 4; U. S. v. Fisher, 2 (*b*) Puff. L. N. b. 5, c. 12, s. 8.

One of these presumptions is that the Legislature does not intend to make any alteration in the law beyond what it explicitly declares (*a*), either in express terms or by implication ; or, in other words, beyond the immediate scope and object of the statute. In all general matters beyond, the law remains undisturbed. It is in the last degree improbable that the Legislature would overthrow fundamental principles, infringe rights, or depart from the general system of law, without expressing its intention with irresistible clearness (*b*) ; and to give any such effect to general words, simply because they have that meaning in their widest, or usual, or natural sense, would be to give them a meaning in which they were not really used. General words and phrases, therefore, however wide and comprehensive in their literal sense, must be construed as strictly limited to the actual objects of the Act, and as not altering the law beyond (*c*).

Thus, a statute which authorised “any” or “the “nearest” justice of the peace to try certain cases, would not authorise a justice to try any such cases out of the territorial limits of his own jurisdiction (*d*) ; or any in which he had a disqualifying

(*a*) *Per* Trevor J. in *Arthur* 278 ; *Wear Commissioners v. Bokenham*, 11 Mod. 150 ; see *Adamson*, 1 Q. B. D. 546, *per* also *Harbert's Case*, 3 Rep. 13b. *Mellish L.J.*, 2 App. 743.

(*b*) 2 Cranch, 390.

(*d*) 1 Hawk. P. C., c. 65, s.

(*c*) See *per* Sir J. Romilly 45 ; *Re Peerless*, 1 Q. B. 153 ; in *Minet v. Leman*, 20 Beav. *R. v. Fylingdales*, 7 B. & C. 438.

interest or a bias (*a*); or which he was incapacitated by any other general principle of law from hearing (*b*); still less to hear them by any other course of proceeding than that established by law (*c*). So, the Debtors' Act, 1869, empowering "any (inferior) "Court" to commit for default of payment of a debt under fifty pounds, in pursuance of an order or judgment of "that or any other competent Court," did not authorise such a Court to commit, unless the debtor was subject to its general jurisdiction by residence or business (*d*). An Act which authorised a distress would not authorise a seizure of goods in custodia legis (*e*). The provision in the Judicature Act of 1873, that the Court might grant an injunction in all cases in which it should consider it "just "and convenient" that such an order should be made, did not extend the authority of the Court beyond cases where there was an invasion of recognised legal or equitable rights (*f*). The provisions in Order LV., Rule 1, of the Judicature Act and the

(*a*) *R. v. Cheltenham*, 1 Q. B. 467; *R. v. Meyer*, 1 Q. B. D. 173; *R. v. L.C.C.*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 190.

(*b*) *Bonham's Case*, 8 Rep. 118a; *Great Charte v. Kennington*, 2 Stra. 1173; *R. v. Sainsbury*, 4 T. R. 456.

(*c*) *Dalt. c. 6*, s. 6.

(*d*) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 62;

Washer v. Elliot, 1 C. P. D. 169.

(*e*) 17 & 18 Vict. c. 104, s. 523; *The Westmoreland*, 2 W. Rob. 394.

(*f*) Sect. 25, sub-s. 8; *Beddow v. Beddow*, 9 Ch. D. 89; *Day v. Brownrigg*, 10 Ch. D. 294; and *per Lord Hatherley*, in *Reuss v. Bos*, L. R. 5 App. 193.

Regulation of Railways Act, 1873, that the costs of and incidental to proceedings should be in the discretion of the Court was construed as giving no wider discretion than had always been exercised by the Court of Chancery, and therefore as not authorising an order on a successful defendant to pay a portion of the plaintiff's costs (α).

An Act which provided that a mayor should not be, by reason of his office, ineligible as a town councillor or alderman, would not make him eligible when he acted in the judicial capacity of returning officer at the election ; for it would not be a just construction of the language used, or a legitimate inference from it, that the Legislature had intended to repeal by a mere side-wind the principle of law that a man cannot be a judge in his own case (*b*). So, an Act which directed the election of officers, would be understood as authorising it only on a lawful day, and not on a Sunday (*c*); and if it declared that the candidate who had the majority of votes should be deemed elected, it would be construed as not intending to override the general principle, that voters who vote for a person whom they know to be ineligible, throw away their votes (*d*).

(a) *Foster v. G. W. R. Co.*, Weymouth, 48 L. J. M. C. 139;
8 Q. B. D. 515; *Re Mills' Estate*, 34 Ch. D. 24. *R. v. Henley*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 504;
R. v. Morton, [1892] 1 Q. B. 39.

(b) *R. v. Owens*, 2 E. & E. 86; *R. v. Tewkesbury*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 629; *R. v. Milledge*, 4 Q. B. D. 332, S. C. nom. *R. v.*

(c) *R. v. Butler*, 1 W. Bl. 649; *R. v. Bridgewater*, 1 Cowp. 139.

(d) *R. v. Coates*, 3 E. & B. 249; *Beresford-Hope v. Lady*

In the same way, a statute requiring a recognizance would not be understood as giving competency to minors and married women to bind themselves by such an instrument (*a*). The Statute of Westminster 2, which gave a judgment creditor the writ of *elegit* to take half the lands of his debtor, did not authorise the issue of the writ against the heir of the debtor during his minority (*b*). So, the 43 Eliz. c. 2, in making the mother and grandmother of an illegitimate child liable to maintain it, did not reach them when under coverture (*c*); and an Act which punished "every person" who deserted his or her children would not apply to a married woman whom her husband had deserted (*d*).

So, the enactment which gave a vote for the election of town councillors to every "person" of full age who had occupied a house for a certain time, and provided that words importing the masculine gender should include females for all purposes relating to the right to vote, was held, having regard to the general scope of the Act, to remove only that disability which was

- | | |
|--|--|
| Sandhurst, 23 Q. B. D. 79; R. | 554; Hussey's Case, 9 Rep. 73. |
| <i>v. How</i> , 33 L. J. M. C. 53; | (<i>b</i>) 2 Inst. 395. |
| Campbell <i>v. Maund</i> , 5 A. & E. | (<i>c</i>) <i>Custodes v. Jinkes</i> , Styles, |
| 865; <i>R. v. St. Matthew</i> , 32 Law | 283; <i>Draper v. Glenfield</i> , 2 |
| Times, N. S. 558; <i>R. v. Wim-</i> | Bulstr. 345; <i>Coleman v. Birming-</i> |
| bledon Loc. Board, 51 L. J. | ham, 6 Q. B. D. 615 (see 33 & |
| Q. B. 219. | 34 Vict. c. 93, s. 14). |
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Bennett v. Watson</i> , 3 M. | (<i>d</i>) <i>Peters v. Cowie</i> , 2 Q. B. |
| & S. 1; <i>Exp. Barrow</i> , 3 Ves. | D. 131. |

founded on sex, but not to affect that which was the result of marriage as well as sex, and therefore not to give the right of voting to married women (a). An Act which simply left the determination of a matter to a majority of vestrymen "present at the meeting" would not affect the common law right of the minority to demand a poll; and the "meeting" would therefore be understood as continuing until the end of the poll (b). Order XXXVIII., Rule 7, under which the Court has power in any cause or matter at any stage of the proceedings to order the attendance of any person for the purpose of producing any documents which the Court may think fit to be produced, and which such person could be compelled to produce at the trial, does not authorise an order for the production of documents against a person not a party to the litigation, when there is no trial or application pending, and the production is not necessary for carrying out an order already made (c).

In making copyholds devisable, the Wills Act, 1 Vict. c. 26, was construed as not intending to inter-

(a) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 55, s. 12 C. B. N. S. 383; *R. v. St. Mary*, 3 Nev. & P. 416; *R. v. 361*; see *Chorlton v. Lings*, L. R. 4 C. P. 374; *Re March*, 27 Ch. D. 166; *Beresford-Hope v. Sandhurst*, 23 Q. B. D. 79.

(b) 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 76, s. 18; *R. v. How*, 33 L. J. M. C. 53; *White v. Steele*, 12 C. B. N. S. 383; *R. v. St. Mary*, 3 Nev. & P. 416; *R. v. D'Oyly*, 12 A. & E. 139; *Re Chillington Iron Co.*, 29 Ch. D. 159. See *R. v. Wimbledon L. Bd.*, 8 Q. B. D. 459.

(c) *Elder v. Carter*, 25 Q. B. D. 194.

fere with the relation of lord and tenant; and consequently the devised copyholds did not vest immediately in the devisee, but remained in the customary heir until the devisee's admittance (*a*). So, the 39 Eliz. c. 5, which gave to "all persons" seised of lands in fee, power to found hospitals, was construed as not conferring that power on corporate bodies which were disabled from alienation; though the word "persons" was wide enough to include corporations, and indeed extended to those corporate bodies which possessed the power of alienation, such as municipalities (*b*). Again, the Wills Act of Hen. VIII., which empowered "all persons" to devise their lands, did not legalise a devise of land to a corporation (*c*), nor would it have enabled lunatics or minors to make a will, even if the 33 & 34 Hen. VIII. s. 14 had not been passed to prevent a different construction (*d*). The object of the Legislature was, obviously, only to confer a new power of disposition on persons already of capacity to deal with their property, not to relieve

(*a*) *Garland v. Meade*, L. R. 6 Q. B. 411. See also, as to choses in action, *Bishop v. Curtis*, 18 Q. B. 878.

(*b*) 2 Inst. 721; *Corp. of Newcastle v. The Atty.-Gen.*, 12 Cl. & F. 402.

(*c*) 28 Hen. VIII. c. 1; *Jesus College Case*, *Duke, Charit. Uses*, 78; *Braneth v. Havering*,

Id. 83; *Christ's Hospital v. Hawes*, *Id.* 84.

(*d*) *Beckford v. Wade*, 17 Ves. 91; comp. *O'Shanassy v. Joachim*, 1 App. Cas. 82; and as to married women, before the 45 & 46 Vict. c. 75, see *Willock v. Noble*, L. R. 7 H. L. 580; *Doe v. Bartle*, 5 B. & Ald. 492.

from disability from disposing or taking those who were under such incapacity.

A charitable provision for the support of "maimed" soldiers would not extend to soldiers who had been maimed in the service of a foreign state, or in punishment of a crime (*a*). A statute which enacted that "every conveyance" in a particular form should be "valid," would not receive the sweeping effect, so foreign to its object, as that of curing a defect of title (*b*).

So, the Tithe Commutation Act, in declaring maps made under its provisions, "satisfactory evidence" of the matters therein stated, would not have the effect of making them evidence on a question of title between landowners, a matter foreign to the scope of the Act (*c*). So, a ship built in England for a foreigner would not be a "British ship" within the provisions requiring registration and transfer by bill of sale, even while still the property of the English builder (*d*). The Bankrupt Act which made a composition accepted under certain circumstances by creditors binding on all creditors "whose names are shown in the debtor's statement," with the proviso that it "shall not affect any other creditor,"

(*a*) Duke, Charit. Uses, 134. (*c*) 6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 71, s.
 (*b*) Ward v. Scott, 3 Camp. 64; Wilberforce v. Hearfield, 5
 234; see also Whidborne v. Ch. D. 709.
 Eccles. Com., 7 Ch. D. 375; (*d*) Union Bank v. Lenanton,
 Forbes v. Eccles. Com., 15 E. 1. 51. 3 C. P. D. 243.

excluded only non-assenting creditors, but not creditors whose names were not stated in the debtor's statement, who, in fact, assented; for it was understood as not intending to interfere with the general principle that it is competent to a person to bind himself by such an assent (*a*). The 12 Car. II. c. 17, which enacted that all persons presented to benefices in the time of the Commonwealth, and who should conform as directed by the Act, should be confirmed therein, "notwithstanding any act or thing whatsoever," was obviously not intended to apply to a person who had been simoniacally presented (*b*). It is evident that a literal construction would, in these cases, have carried the operation of the Act far beyond the intention.

So, the 6th section of the Habeas Corpus Act which, for the prevention of unjust vexation by reiterated commitments for the same offence, enacts that no person who has been discharged on habeas corpus shall be imprisoned again for "the same offence," except by the Court wherein he is bound by recognizances to appear, or other Court having jurisdiction in the cause, would not extend to a case where the discharge was made on the ground that the commitment had been made without jurisdiction, though the offence for which he was arrested on the

(*a*) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, s. 126; *Campbell v. Im Thurn*, 1 C. P. D. 267. (*b*) *Crawley v. Philips*, 1 Sid. 222.

second occasion was the same ; for this was obviously beyond the object of the Act (a).

So, it was held that the provision of the Statute of Limitations, 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 27, s. 26, which deprives the owner of lands of the right of suing in equity for their recovery, on the ground of fraud, from a purchaser who did not know or have reason to believe that any such fraud had been committed, was to be construed subject to the presumption that the Legislature had not intended, by its general language, to subvert the established principles of equity on the subject of constructive notice ; and was therefore read as meaning that the purchaser did not know or have reason to believe, either by himself, or by some agent whose knowledge or reason to believe is, in equity, equivalent to his own (b). Section 47 of the Fines and Recoveries Act, which excludes the jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery in regard to the supplying of defects in the execution of the powers of disposition given by the Act to tenants in tail, and the supplying under any circumstances of the want of execution of such powers of disposition, has been held not to exclude the jurisdiction of the Court to rectify a deed made under the Act so as to make it effect the intention of the parties ; the object of the Act being to prevent the application of

(a) 31 Car. II. c. 2 ; Atty.-Gen. v. Kwok Ah Sing, L. R. 5 P. C. 179. (b) Vane v. Vane, L. R. 8 Ch. 383.

equitable doctrines so as to alter the effect of a deed executed according to the intention of the parties, and not to exclude the power of the Court to rectify a deed which by an error did not conform to that intention (*a*).

The Toleration Act, which exempts Dissenters from prosecution in the Ecclesiastical Courts for not conforming to the Church of England, does not exempt a clergyman of the Church who has seceded from it, from prosecution in those Courts for performing the Anglican church service in a dissenting chapel not licensed by the bishop; for this is a breach of discipline, and not within the scope and object of the Act (*b*). The statute 27 Geo. III. c. 44, which enacted that no suit should be commenced in any Ecclesiastical Court for incontinence or brawling after the expiration of eight months from the commission of the offence, would apply only to suits which might be brought against laymen as well as against clergymen. It would therefore apply to a suit against a clergyman, when its object was the reformation of his manners, or his soul's health; but it would not apply to a suit for deprivation for the same offences, for this is a matter of Church government, foreign to the object and scope of the statute (*c*). The provision of the Factors

(*a*) 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 74,
s. 47; *Hall Dare v. Hall Dare*,
31 Ch. D. 251; see also *Bankes*
v. Small, 36 Ch. D. 716.

(*b*) 1 W. & M. St. 1; *Barnes*
v. Shore, 8 Q. B. 640.

(*c*) *Free v. Burgoyne*, 5 B. &
C. 400.

Act, which enacts that "any agent entrusted with "the possession of goods" shall be deemed their owner, so far as to give validity to a pledge of them, is confined by the general scope and object of the enactment to mercantile agents and transactions; and would therefore not give validity to a pledge of household furniture, not in the way of trade, made by an agent to whose possession it had been entrusted (a). So a Colonial Insolvent Act, which provided that no distress for rent should be levied after an order of sequestration had been made, was construed as limited to distress on the goods of the insolvent. To apply it to the goods of a stranger taken on the insolvent's premises, would have extended the operation of the Act to effects and consequences beyond the policy (b). An Act which empowered the directors of an incorporated company to make contracts and bargains with workmen, agents, and undertakers, would be construed as conferring on them authority to bind the company without consulting their shareholders, by such transactions; but not as so altering the general law as to dispense with those formalities by which alone a

(a) 5 & 6 Vict. c. 39; Wood *Fuentes v. Montis*, L. R. 3 v. Rowcliffe, 6 Hare, 191; C. P. 263, 4 C. P. 93; Johnson Baines *v. Swainson*, 4 B. & S. 270; *Cole v. N. W. Bank*, L. R. 10 C. P. 354, 372. See further limitations of the meaning of the same enactment, in

(b) *Railton v. Wood*, 15 App. Cas. 363. See *Brocklehurst v. Law*, 7 E. & B. 176.

corporation can bind itself to contracts, that is, by writing under the corporate seal (*a*). So the provision of the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, that "a married woman shall be capable of suing "and being sued in all respects as if she were a feme "sole," is limited to actions relating to herself personally, and does not make her competent to act as a next friend or guardian *ad litem* (*b*).

The provision in the Friendly Societies Act, which requires a reference to arbitration of "every matter "in dispute" between a society and any of its members would, on the same principle, be confined to disputes with members as members; and a breach of covenant by a member to repay a sum borrowed from his society was therefore held not to fall within the arbitration clause, as the dispute would be with the member as debtor, not as member (*c*); and the power given by the Judicature Act, 1873, s. 56, to refer "any question arising in any cause or matter" to an official or special referee, applies only to questions which must necessarily be decided in the cause

(*a*) London Waterworks Co. v. Bailey, 4 Bing. 283. Willis, [1892] 2 Q. B. 225; Fleming v. Self, 3 De G. M. & G.

(*b*) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 75, s. 997; Mulkern v. Lord, 4 App. Cas. 182. Comp. Wright v. Monarch Invest. Soc., 5 Ch. D. 726, and

(*c*) 10 Geo. IV. c. 56, s. 27; Morrison v. Glover, 4 Ex. 430. Hack v. London Provid. Building Soc., 23 Ch. D. 103; See also Prentice v. London, Municipal Building Soc. v. L. R. 10 C. P. 679; Willis v. Kent, 9 App. Cas. 260.

or matter, and not to such as it may prove unnecessary to decide (*a*). Section 52 of the National Debt Act, 1870, which directs the Bank of England to keep a list of unclaimed stock, which is to be "open for inspection at the usual hours of business," would not entitle a person who has no *bonâ fide* interest in any unclaimed stock to inspect such list (*b*). An Act of the Manx Legislature, intituled for amending the criminal law, which declared that its provisions should not affect the right of the Courts to punish contempts as before, and that the House of Keys, the Clerk of the Rolls, and the registrars of Ecclesiastical Courts, should, "when in the execution "of their respective offices," have the power of punishing contempts in the same manner as a Court, was construed as limiting this power to the House of Keys only when exercising judicial, not legislative functions. To give it that power when exercising the latter was obviously foreign to the object of the Act, though the language, in its primary and full sense, included it (*c*). On similar grounds a conveyance of property, knowingly (*d*) made solely for the purpose of giving a vote contrary to the 7 & 8 Will. III. c. 25,

(*a*) 36 & 37 Vict. c. 66; the 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 71; *Weed v. Ward*, 40 Ch. D. 555. *Hanmer v. Chance*, 34 L. J.

(*b*) 33 & 34 Vict. c. 71; R. Ch. 413; *Crisp v. Martin*, 2 v. Bank of England, [1891] 1 P. D. 15.

Q. B. 785. (*d*) *Marshall v. Bown*, 7 M.

(*c*) *Re Brown*, 33 L. J. Q. B. & Gr. 188; *Hoyland v. Bremner*, 193, 280. See also cases on 2 C. B. 84.

s. 7, which declares such conveyances "void and of none effect," is void so far as to prevent the right of voting being acquired, which is the whole aim of the Act; but it is in other respects valid between the parties, so as to pass the property (a).

The Judicature Act, 1873, which (s. 19) gives the Court of Appeal jurisdiction to hear appeals from "any judgment or order" save as thereafter (s. 47) mentioned, was held not to give an appeal against an order of discharge of a prisoner on habeas corpus (though the order was not within the exception), on the ground partly that as no provision was made for enforcing an order of the Court of Appeal for re-arresting the prisoner, the order would therefore be futile, and partly that so important a change of the law was not contemplated by the Legislature (b). And the provisions of Order XXXI., Rules 1 and 14, which entitle a defendant to interrogate a plaintiff, and to discovery of documents, were held not to extend to the case of infant plaintiffs who were not subject to such discovery in Chancery proceedings before the Judicature Acts were passed (c).

In the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96, which consolidates the

(a) *Philpotts v. Philpotts*, 10 C. B. 85.

(b) *Bell-Cox v. Hakes*, 15 App. Cas. 506, *per* Lords Halsbury L.C., Watson, Bramwell, and Macnaghten; *diss.* Lords Morris and Field.

(c) *Mayor v. Collins*, 24 Q. B. D. 261. See *Redfern v. Redfern*, [1891] P. 139; *Curtis v. Mundy*, [1892] 2 Q. B. 178. The law is now altered by Order XXXI. r. 29.

law relating to larceny and analogous offences, the provision which imposes a penalty for "unlawfully" and wilfully" killing a pigeon under circumstances not amounting to larceny, was construed as not applying to a man who had intentionally and without legal justification shot his neighbour's pigeons which were in the habit of feeding upon his land; his object being to prevent a recurrence of the trespass. His act was "unlawful," in the sense that it was actionable; and it was undoubtedly "wilful" also; but as the object and scope of the Act was to punish crimes and not mere civil injuries, the word "unlawfully" was construed as "against the criminal law" (a). So, an Act which visited with fine and dismissal a road surveyor who demanded or wilfully received higher fees than those allowed by the Act, would not affect a surveyor who, under an honest mistake of fact, demanded a fee to which he was not entitled (b); and a sheriff's officer who had made an overcharge by mistake would not be liable to the penalty imposed by s. 29 of the Sheriffs Act, 1887, upon any sheriff's officer who takes or demands any money or reward, under any pretence whatever, other than the fees or sums allowed (c). An Act which empowered in-

(a) *Taylor v. Newman*, 4 B. & S. 89. See also *Kenyon v. Hart*, 6 B. & S. 249; *Daniel v. Janes*, 2 C. P. D. 351; *Spicer v. Barnard*, 1 E. & E. 874.

(b) *R. v. Badger*, 6 E. & B. 137.

(c) 50 & 51 Vict. c. 55; *Lee v. Danger*, [1892] 2 Q. B. 337; see also *Bowman v. Blyth*, 7 E. & B. 26.

spectors to inspect the scales, weights and measures of persons offering goods for sale, and of seizing any found "light and unjust," was construed as limited to cases where the injustice was prejudicial to the buyer, but as not applying to a balance which gave seventeen ounces to the pound, that is, which was unjust against the seller; since the object and scope of the Act was limited to the protection of the former (*a*). So, where a statute makes it an offence in certain cases for any person to intimidate any other person, but provides that nothing in the Act shall apply to seamen, it has been held that the proviso only operates where the offence is committed by a seaman, and not where it is committed against a seaman (*b*). And the enactment in s. 14 of the Bills of Sale Amendment Act, 1882, that a bill of sale shall be no protection in respect of chattels which but for such bill of sale would have been liable to distress for rates and taxes, must be restricted to cases of distress for such rates and taxes, as it could not possibly have been intended that a bill of sale should be no protection against an execution on a judgment if the goods seized were liable to distress for non-payment of rates (*c*).

An Act which, after appointing trustees to pull

(*a*) *Brooke v. Shadgate*, L. R. ss. 7, 16; *Kennedy v. Cowie*, 8 Q. B. 352. See *Edwards v.* [1891] 1 Q. B. 771.

Dick, 4 B. & Ald. 212; *East* (*c*) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 43, s. 14; *Wimbledon Loc. Bd. v. Gloucestershire R. Co.* *v. Bartholomew*, L. R. 3 Ex. 15. *Underwood*, 61 L. J. Q. B.

(*b*) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 86, 484.

down and rebuild a parish church, authorised them to allot the pews and to sell the fee simple of such of them as were not appropriated by the Act, to the inhabitants of the parish, with power to the owners to dispose of them, was held not to authorise a conveyance of the soil and freehold of the land on which the pews stood, but only the grant of an easement, or right to sit in the pew during divine service (a). And where a church was built, under a similar Act, by subscribers in whom the freehold was vested, and the trustees had power to sell the pews ; and a subsequent Act, reciting that doubts had arisen as to the estate and interest which the subscribers and proprietors had in the pews, enacted that the fee simple should be vested in them, it was held that it was not the freehold interest in the soil that was vested in them, but a special interest created by Parliament in the easement (b). So, the Public Health Act of 1875, which enacted that the streets should vest in the local authority, was construed as intending, not that the soil and freehold should vest, but only the surface of the soil, and as much of it in depth as was necessary for doing all that was reasonably and usually done in streets (c),

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(a) <i>Hinde v. Chorlton</i>, L. R. 2 C. P. 104.</p> <p>(b) <i>Brumfitt v. Roberts</i>, L. R. 5 C. P. 224.</p> <p>(c) <i>Coverdale v. Charlton</i>, 4 Q. B. D. 104. Compare <i>Wands-</i></p> | <p><i>worth Board of Works v. United Telephone Co.</i>, 13 Q. B. D. 904; <i>Baird v. Tunbridge Wells</i>, [1894] 2 Q. B. 867. And see <i>Attorney-General v. Dorking</i>, 20 Ch. D. 595.</p> |
|--|--|

K

and for so long only as it continued to be a street (a).

Section 12 of 35 & 36 Vict. c. 86, which enacts that no action entered in a local Court of record shall be removed into a superior Court except by leave of a judge of a superior Court in cases which shall appear to such judge "fit" to be tried in a superior Court, would not authorise such removal unless the action were more fit to be tried in the superior than the inferior Court (b).

The same general principle appears to govern the class of cases which establish that enactments which require railway or other companies to make to persons interested in hereditaments taken or injuriously affected by the companies, full compensation not only for the land but for all damage sustained by such persons by reason of the exercise of such parliamentary powers, are limited to cases where the damage would have been actionable but for the Act; and relates, not to the person or business of the party prejudiced by the user of the railway in the way authorised by the Act after it is opened to the public, but only to damage caused by the construction of the railway and works, to his estate or right in the land in statu quo, without regard to any use to which it might be put (c). In

(a) *Rolls v. St. George, South-*
wark, 14 Ch. D. 785.

(b) *Banks v. Hollingsworth*,
[1893] 1 Q. B. 442.

(c) See *per Cockburn C.J.*
in *New River Co. v. Johnson*,
2 E. & E. 435; *per Willes J.*
in *Beckett v. The Midland R.*

other words, the object of the enactments is not to create new rights, but to give compensation for actual injury (α) where the right of action has been taken away. And this right being taken away only when the powers are in all respects duly exercised, the provisions for compensation do not extend to cases where injury has been done through their improper or negligent exercise (b).

The Act which required the registration of bills of sale of personal chattels, under which expression fixtures were expressly included, gave rise to several decisions governed by the principle in question. The object of the enactment obviously did not extend to requiring the registration of every mortgage under which fixtures might happen to pass,

Co., L. R. 3 C. P. 94; *Brand v. Hammersmith Ry. Co.*, 4 H. L. 171; *Ricket v. Metrop. R. Co.*, L. R. 2 H. L. 175; *Hall v. Bristol, L. R. 2 C. P. 322*; *R. v. Vaughan*, L. R. 4 Q. B. 190; *R. v. Metrop. Board*, Id. 358; *Hopkins v. G. W. R. Co.*, 2 Q. B. D. 224; *Chamberlain v. West End and Crystal Pal. R. Co.*, 2 B. & S. 617; *Senior v. Metropolitan Board of Works*, 2 H. & C. 258; *R. v. Metropolitan Board of Works*, 3 B. & S. 719; *Caledonian Ry. Co. v. Walker's Trustees*, 7 App. Cas. 259.

Comp. MacCarthy v. Metrop. Board, L. R. 7 H. L. 243; *Glasgow R. Co. v. Hunter*, L. R. 2 Sc. App. 78; *Rhodes v. Airedale*, 1 C. P. D. 380; *Ford v. Metrop. Ry.*, 17 Q. B. D. 12.

(a) *R. v. Poulter*, 20 Q. B. D. 132.

(b) *Clothier v. Webster*, 12 C. B. N. S. 790; *Gibbs v. Liverpool Docks*, and *Ruck v. Williams*, 3 H. & N. 164, 308; and see the cases collected in *White v. Fellowes*, 10 C. B. N. S. 780.

for this would include most mortgages of real property; and it has been held that the Act applied only to cases where the fixtures were dealt with as separate things. Accordingly, a mortgage of a house for a term of years, with such a separate assignment of the fixtures, that the mortgagee might sever and deal with them as distinct from the house, required registration (a); but a mortgage for a term of years of a house with its fixtures, and with a general power of sale over the mortgaged property, not authorising a separate dealing by the mortgagee with the fixtures, did not require registration (b). The 10th section of the Judicature Act, 1875, which provides that in the administration of the assets of a person dying insolvent, the same rules shall be applied as to the respective rights of secured and unsecured creditors, and as to the debts provable, as are in force in bankruptcy, has similarly been the subject of several decisions limiting the scope of its operation (c).

The Metropolitan Building Act of 1855, which gives a right to raise any party structure authorised

- (a) 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36; 1 Ch. 686; see also *Marsden v. Hawtrey v. Butlin*, L. R. 8 Q. B. 290, Exp. *Daglish*, L. R. 8 Ch. 1072; *Waterfall v. Penistone*, 6 E. & B. 876; *R. v. Trethowan*, 5 Ch. D. 559; *Re Eslick*, 4 Ch. D. 496; *Climpson v. Coles*, 23 Q. B. D. 465; *Small v. Nat. Prov. Bank*, [1894] 1 Ch. 686; see also *Marsden v. Meadows*, 7 Q. B. D. 80.
- (b) Exp. *Barclay*, L. R. 9 Ch. 576; *Mather v. Fraser*, 2 K. & J. 536; *Re Yates*, 38 Ch. D. 112.
- (c) See *Re Maggi*, 20 Ch. D. 545, and the cases cited there, and *Re D'Epineuil*, Id. 217.

by the Act, on condition of "making good all "damage" occasioned thereby to the adjoining premises, was held not to authorise the raising of a structure which obstructed the ancient lights of the adjoining premises; for the only damage contemplated by the Act was structural, and not that which resulted from the invasion of a right. And, having regard to the scope of the enactment, the expression "making good" was understood to mean that the adjoining premises were to be restored to their original state, not that pecuniary compensation should be made (a).

Some decisions on the construction of the 74th section of the Harbours Act of 1847, illustrate the principle under consideration. That section enacts that the owner of a vessel is to be answerable for any damage done by it, or by any person employed in it, to a harbour, pier or dock, except when the vessel is in charge of a compulsorily taken pilot. Construed literally, as it was by the Queen's Bench (b), it made an owner responsible for the injury done by his ship to a pier, after she had been driven aground and necessarily abandoned by her crew, and was dashed by the storm against the pier. The Court of Exchequer Chamber thought that the enactment was to be construed as tacitly excepting damage done by the act of God and the Queen's enemies, for which

(a) *Crofts v. Haldane*, L. R. 2 Q. B. 194.

(b) 10 Vict. c. 27; *Dennis v. Tovell*, L. R. 8 Q. B. 10.

by the general law of the land, a shipowner is not responsible (*a*). The House of Lords held, that the owner was not liable, on the ground that the general scope and object of the Act was merely to collect the clauses which Parliament usually inserted in local harbour bills, and to give facilities of procedure to the undertakers of such works; and that the section did not create a new liability, but only facilitated proceedings against the registered owner when damages were recoverable (*b*).

Another instance is afforded by s. 3 of the Common Lodging-Houses Act, 1853, which forbids the keeping of "a common lodging-house," unless it has been inspected, approved, and registered. The object of the enactment being to prevent the overcrowding and want of cleanliness which might naturally result from the desire of gain on the part of those who keep such houses for profit, it was held not to apply to a lodging-house for the reception of male lodgers, who slept in a common room capable of holding a hundred persons, and were charged at the discretion of the manager a sum not exceeding fourpence a night for bed, supper, and breakfast, the place being maintained for charitable and religious purposes, and not for gain (*c*).

(*a*) *Wear Commissioners v. Adamson*, L. R. 1 Q. B. D. 546.

(*b*) *Id.* 2 App. 743.

(*c*) 14 & 15 Vict. c. 28, and 16 & 17 Vict. c. 41; *Booth v. Ferrett*, 25 Q. B. D. 87.

On this general principle of construction, a statute which made in unqualified terms an act criminal or penal, would be understood as not applying where the act was excusable or justifiable on grounds generally recognised by law. Thus, a statute which imposed three months' imprisonment and the forfeiture of wages on a servant who "absented himself from his service" before his term of service was completed, would necessarily be understood as confined to cases where there was no lawful excuse for the absence (*a*). A statute which made it felony "to break from prison," would not apply to a prisoner who broke out from the prison on fire, not to recover his liberty, but to save his life (*b*); and one which declared it piracy to "make a revolt in a ship," would not include a revolt necessary to restrain the master from unlawfully killing persons on board (*c*), even if it could be justly called a revolt. And a seaman would not be guilty of "deserting," who was driven by the cruelty of his officers to leave his ship (*d*). The sheriff who arrests under a warrant the driver of the mails, is not indictable for knowingly and wilfully obstructing and retarding the mail (*e*).

(*a*) 4 Geo. IV. c. 34, s. 3; s. 9; *R. v. Rose*, 2 Cox, 329; *Re Turner*, 9 Q. B. 80. See *The Shepherdess*, 5 Rob. 262. also 21 Hen. VIII. c. 13, Gibs. (*d*) *Edward v. Trevellick*, 4 Cod. 887. E. & B. 59.

(*b*) 2 Inst. 560.

(*e*) *U. S. v. Kirby*, 7 Wallace,

(*c*) 11 & 12 Will. III. c. 7, 482.

✓ As mens rea, or a guilty mind, is, with few exceptions, an essential element in constituting a breach of the criminal law, a statute, however comprehensive and unqualified it be in its language, is usually understood as silently requiring that this element should be imported into it, unless a contrary intention be expressed or implied. A statute, for instance, which in general terms enacted that every person who committed a certain act should be adjudged a felon, would not include a child under seven, or an idiot, or a lunatic during the loss of his reason (*a*), or a man in a state of mental insensibility caused by intoxication (*b*); for it would be unreasonable to infer from the mere use of an unqualified term, an intention to repeal the general principle that such persons are not capable of a criminal intention.

On the same principle, an act done under an honest and reasonable belief in the existence of a state of things, which if true would have afforded a complete justification, both legally and morally, for such act, would not, in general, fall within a statute which prohibited it under a penalty (*c*). Thus, ✓ a woman who married a second time within seven years after she had been deserted by her husband,

(*a*) 1 Hale, 706; *Eyston v. Studd*, Plowd. 459*a*; Bac. Ab. Stat. (I.) 6. See Exp. Stamp, De Gex, 345.

(*b*) *R. v. Moore*, 3 C. & K. 319.

(*c*) See ex. gr. *Lee v. Simpson*, 3 C. B. 871.

under a *bonâ fide* belief on reasonable grounds that he was dead, would not be guilty of bigamy (a). And under a statute which made it felony for persons tumultuously assembled to demolish a church or dwelling, they could not be convicted if the demolition was done in the *bonâ fide* assertion of a legal right, though there was a riot in doing it (b). So, if a man cut down a tree or demolished a house standing on land of which he was in undisturbed possession, and believed himself to be the owner, he would not be punishable under statutes which prohibited such acts in general terms; though it turned out that his title was bad and that the property was not his (c). If he demanded goods with threats, *bonâ fide* believing that they belonged to him, he would not be guilty of robbery, though civilly liable (d). If he forcibly took a girl under sixteen from the custody of her guardian, in the honest but mistaken belief that he was, himself, invested with that character, and acted simply in the exercise of his right as guardian, he would not be guilty of the criminal offence of abduction, though that is defined as "unlawfully taking a girl under

(a) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 57;
R. v. Tolson, 23 Q. B. D. 168.

(b) R. v. Phillips, 2 Moo. C. C. 252; S. C. nom. R. v. Langford, Car. & M. 602. See R. v. Badger, 6 E. & B. 137; sup., p. 127.

(c) R. v. Burnaby, 2 Lord Raym. 900.

(d) R. v. Hale, 3 C. & P. 409. See also and comp. R. v. Cridland, 7 E. & B. 853, and Morden v. Porter, 7 C. B. N. S. 641.

“sixteen out of the possession and against the will of the person having the lawful care of her” (a). A man who fished in a tidal river, in the assertion of the general right which the law gives to fish in such rivers (b), and in ignorance or in contestation of the exclusive right of fishing in it claimed by another, would not be liable to conviction of “unlawfully “and wilfully” fishing in the private fishery of another (c). On this principle may perhaps rest the general rule of law that the jurisdiction given to justices of the peace, to try an offence summarily, is ousted when a claim of right or title is set up on reasonable grounds (d); though their duty in such cases is, not to acquit, but to forbear from adjudicating.

But how far ignorance or erroneous belief of a fact which is essential to the offence is material, is a question which has given rise to some controversy and conflict of decisions. The substance of these decisions is, however, that it is necessary to look at the object of each Act that is under consideration to see whether and how far knowledge is of the essence of the offence created (e). Thus, the offence of unlawfully taking

- | | |
|--|---|
| (a) <i>R. v. Tinkler</i> , 1 F. & F. 513. But see <i>R. v. Prince</i> , L. R. 2 C. C. R. 154, <i>infra</i> . | (d) <i>Per</i> Blackburn J. in <i>White v. Feast</i> , L. R. 7 Q. B. 353; <i>Reece v. Miller</i> , 51 L. J. M. C. 64. |
| (b) <i>Carter v. Murcot</i> , 4 Burr. 2163. | (e) <i>Per</i> Stephen J. in <i>Cundy v. Lecoq</i> , 13 Q. B. D. 207. |
| (c) <i>R. v. Stimpson</i> , 4 B. & S. 301. See <i>sup.</i> , 127. | |

a girl under sixteen out of the possession and against the will of her parents, would be committed, although the offender believed, from her appearance and asseverations, contrary to the fact, that she was older (*a*). The object of the Legislature being to prevent a scandalous and wicked invasion of parental rights, it must be supposed that they intended that the wrongdoer should act at his peril (*b*). If, as it has been held, a person would not fall under the enactment which punishes the pursuit of game on the land of another without the consent of the owner, if he had the consent of the person whom he honestly and reasonably believed to be the owner (*c*), he would yet be liable to conviction if he trespassed on land which he believed to be part of the property over which he had the license, but which was in fact the property of a different person (*d*), the statute infringed not being a mere criminal statute, but one passed for the purpose of protecting the peculiar rights of those entitled to shoot game (*e*). The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, and an Order in Council under it, which imposed a penalty on any person having in his possession an animal affected with a contagious disease, who did not give notice of it "with all

(*a*) *Reg. v. Prince*, L. R. 2 30; *R. v. Cridland*, 7 E. & B. 853.
C. C. R. 154. (*d*) *Morden v. Porter*, 7 C. B.

(*b*) *Per Stephen J.* in *Reg. v.* N. S. 641.

Tolson, 23 Q. B. D. 190.

(*e*) *Watkins v. Major*, L. R.

(*c*) 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 32, s. 10 C. P. 662.

“practicable speed” to a constable, was held to apply only where the person knew that the animal was diseased (*a*). But here the only speed reasonably practicable could, reasonably, be computable only from when the knowledge was acquired. Where a railway Act which “for the better prevention of accidents or injury which might arise” on the railway “from the unsafe and improper carriage of certain goods,” enacted that every person who should send gunpowder or similarly dangerous articles by the railway should mark or declare their nature, under a penalty enforceable by imprisonment, it was held that guilty knowledge was essential to a conviction, and that an agent who had sent some cases of dangerous goods by a railway, without mark or declaration, not only in ignorance of their nature, but misinformed of it by his principal in answer to his inquiries, had not incurred the penalty; on the ground that his ignorance, under such circumstances, proved the absence of mens rea (*b*); and yet he was under no legal duty to send the goods, and he might have refused to do so without actual inspection. A similar conclusion was come to where, although there

(*a*) *Nicolls v. Hall*, L. R. 8 and *Roberts v. Humphries*, C. P. 322; and see *Core v. L. R. 8 Q. B. 483*, before the James, L. R. 7 Q. B. 135, and licensing Act of 1874.
Dickenson v. Fletcher, L. R. 9 (*b*) *Heane v. Garton*, 2 E. & C. P. 1. See also *Copley v. E. 66*.
Brown, L. R. 5 C. P. 489,

was no knowledge, there were means of knowledge which were neglected. Under the 9 & 10 Will. III. c. 14, which after reciting that convictions for embezzling Government stores were found impracticable, because direct proof of the immediate taking could rarely be made, but only that the goods were found in the possession of the accused, and that they bore the King's mark, enacted that the person in whose possession goods so marked should be found, should forfeit the goods and £200, unless he produced at the trial an official certificate of the occasion of their coming into his possession, it was held by the Court for Crown cases reserved, that such a person was not liable to conviction, in the absence of proof that he knew (though he had reasonable means of knowing) that the goods bore the Government mark (*a*). This decision, however, might be questioned on the authority of another case, which was not cited, where the Court of Exchequer held that a dealer in tobacco was liable to the penalty imposed by the statute for having adulterated tobacco in his possession, though ignorant of the adultera-

(*a*) *R. v. Sleep*, 1 L. & C. 44; 30 L. J. M. C. 170; *R. v. Willmet*, 3 Cox, 281; *R. v. Cohen*, 8 Cox, 41. See *Aberdare v. Hammett*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 162; also *Hopton v. Thirlwall*, 9 L. T. N. S. 327, where a person found to "have in his possession the young of salmon," in contravention of the Salmon Fisheries Act, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 109, s. 15, was held not liable to conviction, who, though he knew he was in possession, did not know the fish were salmon.

tion (*a*). It may be doubted whether the literal construction of the language, enforcing vigilance for the protection of the public from danger or robbery, by visiting negligence (*b*) as well as misdeed with penal consequences, would not have been more in harmony with the intention, and have more completely promoted the object of the Legislature. In a recent case under the Public Health Act, 1875, s. 117, which empowers a justice to order the destruction of unwholesome meat which is exposed for sale and intended for food, and to impose a fine or imprisonment on the person to whom it belongs, the Court decided that in order to support a conviction of the owner under the section it was not necessary that there should be any proof that he had actual personal knowledge of the condition of the meat, the object of the enactment being that people should not be exposed to the danger of eating poison (*c*). So the sale to the prejudice of the purchaser of an article of food or a drug not of the nature, substance, and quality of the article demanded is an offence under s. 6 of the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875, though the seller was unaware of the fact; the intention of the Legislature being shown by absence of knowledge being made a defence to

- | | |
|--|--|
| (<i>a</i>) 5 & 6 Vict. c. 93; <i>R. v. Woodrow</i> , 15 M. & W. 404. | <i>R. v. Dixon</i> , 3 M. & S. 11. |
| See also <i>per Parke B.</i> in <i>Burnby v. Bollett</i> , 16 M. & W. 644; | (<i>b</i>) Comp. <i>R. v. Stephens</i> , L. R. 1 Q. B. 792. |
| <i>R. v. Trew</i> , 2 East, P. C. 821; | (<i>c</i>) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55; <i>Blaker v. Tillstone</i> , [1894] 1 Q. B. 345. |

charges under other sections of the Act, while nothing is said as to such absence of knowledge in the section in question (*a*). On similar grounds it has been held that a publican would be guilty of an offence against s. 13 of the Licensing Act, 1872, if he sold liquor to a drunken person, even though the purchaser had given no indication of intoxication, and the publican did not know that he was intoxicated (*b*). He would not, however, in such a case be guilty of permitting drunkenness on his premises (*c*). The offence of receiving two or more lunatics in an unlicensed house is committed, though the persons were received in the belief, based on reasonable grounds, that they were not lunatics (*d*). Under the special Act which empowered a gas company to make the necessary works for its business, subject to a penalty if it should "suffer any washings to be conveyed or to flow" into any stream or place, corrupting or fouling the water, the company was held liable to the penalty in a case where the washings percolated through the bottom of its gas tank and polluted a well without the knowledge of its servants (*e*).

The principle that unless the Legislature has in-

(*a*) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 63; B. D. 207.

Betts v. Armstead, 20 Q. B. D. (c) *Somerset v. Wade*, [1894] 771; *Pain v. Boughtwood*, 24 1 Q. B. 574.

Q. B. D. 353; *Dyke v. Gower*, (d) 8 & 9 Vict. c. 100, s. 44; [1892] 1 Q. B. 220. *R. v. Bishop*, 5 Q. B. D. 259.

(b) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94, s. (e) *Hipkins v. Birmingham Gas Co.*, 6 H. & N. 250.

dictated the contrary intention, the infliction of penalties is to be presumed to be confined to cases where the offender has the *mens rea*, is well illustrated by those cases in which it has been sought to render a master penally responsible for the acts of his servant. Thus a sheriff, though unquestionably liable in damages for the act of his officer in seizing things exempt from seizure, would not be liable to the penalty imposed by s. 29 of the Sheriffs Act, 1887, in respect of such wrongful act (*a*); and a surveyor could not be convicted of having caused a heap of stones to be laid upon a highway, and of having allowed it to remain there at night to the danger of any person thereon, where the stones had been laid and allowed to remain there by a carter acting under the orders of a person to whom the surveyor had given general directions as to repairing the road, the surveyor having no personal knowledge of the fact (*b*). So in order to support a criminal charge against an owner or occupier of trade premises within the metropolis of negligently using a furnace employed thereon so that the smoke is not effectually consumed, evidence must be given of negligence on his part, evidence of negligence on the part of a servant being insufficient (*c*). No doubt the legal presump-

- | | |
|---|---|
| (<i>a</i>) 50 & 51 Vict. c. 55, s. 29; <i>Bagge v. Whitehead</i> , [1892] | 1 Q. B. 709. |
| 2 Q. B. 355. | (<i>c</i>) 16 & 17 Vict. c. 128, ss. 1, 2; <i>Chisholm v. Doulton</i> , 22 Q. B. D. 736. <i>Comp. R. v. Stephens</i> , L. R. 1 Q. B. 702. |
| (<i>b</i>) 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 50, s. 56; <i>Hardcastle v. Bielby</i> , [1892] | |

tion is that whatever a servant does in the course of the employment with which he is entrusted, and as part of it, is the master's act, unless the contrary be shown (*a*), and a master may consequently be penally responsible for the act of his servant as if it were his own act, unless he can show that what was done was in contravention of his orders. On this ground a baker has been held liable to a penalty for selling bread in which his servant had mixed alum (*b*); and a carrier, whose waggoner had carried in the carrier's waggon game not sent by a qualified person (when the 5 & 6 Anne, c. 14, was in force), was properly convicted of carrying the game (*c*); a licensed victualler was held penally responsible, under the statute 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94, s. 16, for the act of his servant in knowingly supplying liquor to a constable on duty (*d*), the act being within the scope of the servant's employment (*e*); and where gaming had taken place upon licensed premises to the knowledge of a servant who had been placed in charge of the premises, it was held that the licensed person had "suffered" gaming to be carried on on the premises within the meaning of s. 17 of the Licensing Act, 1872, though he had no knowledge of

(*a*) *Atty.-Gen. v. Siddon*, 1 Cr. & J. 220.

(*b*) *R. v. Dixon*, 3 M. & S. 11.

(*c*) *R. v. Marsh*, 2 B. & C. 717; but see *per* Brett J. in *R. v. Prince*, L. R. 2 C. C. 162.

(*d*) *Mullins v. Collins*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 292; and see *Brown v. Foot*, 61 L. J. M. C. 110.

(*e*) *Per* A. L. Smith J. in *Newman v. Jones*, 17 Q. B. D. 137.

the gaming, and had not connived at it (a). But as soon as it appears that there is no delegation of authority to the servant (b), his act cannot be considered as that of the master, and it is necessary to show that the latter had personal knowledge of the incriminating circumstances in order to ensure conviction. Thus the committee of a club cannot properly be convicted of selling liquor without a proper license, where the sale has been by the steward contrary to the express orders of the committee, and without their knowledge or assent (c); and where gaming had taken place upon licensed premises to the knowledge of a servant who was employed upon the premises, but there was no evidence to show any connivance or wilful blindness on the part of the licensed person, and it did not appear that the servant was put in charge of the premises, it was held that the justices were right in refusing to convict the licensed person of suffering gaming on the premises (d). It may be added that a master would not be liable to be convicted for an unauthorised false representation made by his servant as to the weight of sacks of coal (e).

(a) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94, s. 17; B. D. 132.

Bond v. Evans, 21 Q. B. D. 249.

(b) See *per* Collins J. in Somerset v. Wade, [1894] 1 Q. B. 576, referring to the judgment of Stephen J. in Bond v. Evans, 21 Q. B. D. 256.

(c) Newman v. Jones, 17 Q.

(d) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94, s. 17;

Somerset v. Hart, 12 Q. B. D. 360. See also Massey v. Morris, [1894] 2 Q. B. 412.

(e) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 21, s. 29, sub-s. 2; Roberts v. Woodward, 25 Q. B. D. 412.

There is a class of cases where the absence of mens rea does not control the language of a statute ; and that is where the offence has been committed in ignorance or misapprehension of the law, and the statute prohibiting the act does not expressly make malice or wilfulness or other intent an essential element of the offence (a). For instance, though a person in possession of naval stores is not liable to conviction unless he knows that they bear the Government mark, he would not escape on the ground that he did not know that the possession of such marked goods was prohibited. A man who unlawfully fished in a non-tidal river, or trespassed on land in search of game, would not escape conviction because he honestly believed that the public was entitled to fish or shoot there (b) ; such a right not being known to the law. An apprentice who absented himself from his master's service, did not escape the penal consequences by proving that he had done so in the honest though erroneous belief, founded on his lawyer's advice, that his indentures were void, and that he was consequently at liberty to leave his service (c). So, a cabman who persists in placing his

(a) See *Ellis v. Kelly*, 6 H. & N. 222 ; *Daniel v. Jones*, 2 C. P. D. 351. *Watkins v. Major*, L. R. 10 C. P. 662 ; *Pearce v. Scotcher*, 9 Q. B. D. 162. See also *The*

(b) *Hudson v. McRae*, 4 B. & S. 585 ; *Leatt v. Vine*, 30 L. J. M. C. 207 ; *Hargreaves v. Diddams*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 582 ; *Charlotta*, 1 Dod. 387. (c) 4 Geo. IV. c. 34, s. 3 ; *Cooper v. Simmons*, 7 H. & N. 707, overruling *Rider v. Wood*,

cab on the premises of a railway company, after being requested to remove it, is penally liable for "wilfully trespassing and refusing to quit," though he was under the persuasion, which was unfounded, that there existed a legal right to place his vehicle there (*a*).

It is necessary, as regards *mens rea*, not to confound a guilty mind in the legal sense of the expression, with a guilty conscience or evil intention. A statute which prohibited an act would be violated, though the act were done without evil intention, or even under the influence of a good motive. Thus, in order to constitute the offence of applying a false trade description to goods with intent to defraud, within the meaning of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, s. 2, sub-s. 1, it is not necessary that there should be any fraud, in the sense of intent to supply a worthless or inferior article, but it is sufficient that an article is intended to be supplied of a different description from that which the customer intends to purchase, and believes he is purchasing (*b*). So a man who sells an obscene publication is subject to the penalty imposed on that act by the 20 & 21 Vict. c. 83, although his object was not to deprave the

29 L. J. M. C. 1. See also Taylor, 1 E. & E. 20.

Willett v. Boote, 6 H. & N. (b) 50 & 51 Vict. c. 28 ;
26 ; and Youle v. Mappin, 6 Staney v. Chilworth Gunpowder
H. & N. 753. Co., 24 Q. B. D. 90 ; Wood v.

(a) Foulger v. Steadman, L. Burgess, 24 Q. B. D. 162.
R. 8 Q. B. 65. Comp. Jones v.

mind of the reader, but to expose the tenets of a religious sect (*a*). The master of a ship who, under general instructions to complete his cargo on the best terms, traded with the enemy, would be guilty of the crime (*b*) of barratry, though he acted solely under the motive of serving his employer to the best advantage (*c*). A railway company which had suffered a weighing machine in its possession to continue out of repair for a fortnight, so that it indicated more than the true weight, was held to fall within the enactment which imposed a penalty for being found in possession of a weighing machine incorrect or otherwise unjust; although its servants had orders to make a due allowance for the defect, when using it (*d*). So under s. 31 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, which enacts that where an undischarged bankrupt obtains credit to the extent of £20 and upwards from any person, without informing such person that he is an undischarged bankrupt, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, it is no defence to show that there was no intention to defraud (*e*).

(*a*) *R. v. Hicklin*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 360; *Steele v. Brannan*, L. R. 7 C. P. 261. *Comp. Lewis v. Fermor*, 18 Q. B. D. 532, questioned by *Hawkins J.* in *Ford v. Wiley*, 23 Q. B. D. 203.

(*b*) *Vallejo v. Wheeler*, 1 Cowp. 143.

(*c*) *Earle v. Rowcroft*, 8 East, 126.

(*d*) 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 63, s. 28; *Great Western R. Co. v. Bailie*, 5 B. & S. 928.

(*e*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 52; *R. v. Dyson*, [1894] 2 Q. B. 176.

Sometimes, to keep the Act within the limits of its object, and not to disturb the existing law beyond what that object requires, it is construed as operative between certain persons, or under certain states of facts, or for certain purposes only, though the language expresses no such circumscription of the field of its operation (*a*). The Act of 1854, for instance, which required, among other things, that when a bill of sale was made subject to a declaration of trust, the declaration should be registered as well as the bill, on pain of invalidity against the assignee, in the event of execution or bankruptcy, was held to apply only to declarations of trust by the grantee for the grantor, but not to trusts declared by the grantee in favour of other persons; the object of the Act being only to protect creditors against sham bills of sale, and being completely attained by requiring the registration of the first-mentioned trusts, while the registration of any others would have been foreign to the purposes of the Act (*b*). Section 13 of the Bills of Sale Act, 1882, which prohibits the removal of the goods for five days after seizure, is confined to the protection of the person giving the bill, and gives the landlord no right to complain of an earlier removal (*c*); and s. 3 of 11 Geo. II. c. 19, which

(*a*) For some illustrations, in addition to those which immediately follow, see Chap. VII, Sec. III.

(*b*) *Hills v. Shepherd*, 1 F.

& F. 191; *Robinson v. Collingwood*, 34 L. J. C.P. 18. See also *Hodson v. Sharpe*, 10 East, 350.

(*c*) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 43; *Lane v. Tyler*, 56 L. J. Q. B. 461

gives to landlords a right of action to recover double the value of goods fraudulently carried off the premises to avoid a distress, applies to goods of the tenant only, and not to those of a stranger (*a*). So, the provision in the 8 & 9 Vict. c. 109, which, after making all wagers null and void, enacts that no suit shall be maintained to recover money won on a wager or deposited to abide the event, was construed as only preventing a party to the wager from suing to recover his winning, but not to prevent him from suing the stakeholder to recover his deposit (*b*). So, the general language of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854, s. 299, which provides that, if damage should arise to person or property from non-observance of the sailing rules, it should be considered as the wilful default of the person in charge of the deck at the time, was confined by a due regard to the object in view, to the regulation of the rights of the owners of ships in cases of collision, and was therefore held not to affect the relations between the master and his owners, so as to make the former guilty of barratry, which would have been altogether foreign to the scope of the Act (*c*). The 16 & 17 Vict. c. 30, which, after reciting that it was expedient to make provision for preventing the vexatious removal of indictments into

(*a*) *Tomlinson v. Consolidated Credit Corpn.*, 24 Q. B. D. 135. (*c*) *Grills v. The General Iron Screw Co.*, L. R. 1 C. P. 600,
(*b*) *Hampden v. Walsh*, 1 Q. B. D. 189. 3 C. P. 476.

the Queen's Bench, enacted that whenever a certiorari to remove one should be awarded at the instance of the prosecutor, he should enter into a recognizance to pay the costs if unsuccessful, and that if the recognizance was not entered into, the indictment should be tried in the Court below, was held to have no application to a prosecutor who removed an indictment against a corporate body which was unable to appear by attorney in the inferior Court. In such a case, the removal of the indictment was a matter of necessity, not option, for it could not be tried by the inferior Court, since the defendant could not appear there; and it would have been unjust to extend the provision to a case clearly beyond the scope of the Act, which, the preamble showed, was only to check vexatious removals (*a*). The words of the Arbitration Act, 1889, which enact that in certain cases an award is to be "equivalent to the verdict of a jury," have been construed as not importing all the incidents of a verdict, e.g. the right of appeal on the ground that it is against the weight of evidence, but only the immediate consequences, e.g. the mode of execution (*b*).

The enactment (16 & 17 Vict. c. 59, s. 19) which makes presentment of any draft on a banker payable to order or on demand, if purporting to be indorsed

| | |
|--|---|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>R. v. Manchester</i> , 7 E. & B. 453. See also <i>Craven v. Smith</i> , L. R. 4 Ex. 146. | (<i>b</i>) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 49, ss. 14, 15; <i>Darlington Waggon Co. v. Harding</i> , [1891] 1 Q. B. 245. |
|--|---|

(though a forgery) by the payee, a sufficient authority to the banker to pay the amount, is in the same way limited in its effect, as in its object, to the relations between banker and customer ; and does not prevent the latter from recovering his money from the person who received it (a). The 16th section of the Companies Clauses Consolidation Act, which provides that no shareholder shall be entitled to transfer any share after a call, until he has paid up all calls due on all his shares, is only a protection to the company, giving it a lien or charge upon the shares ; but it does not affect the validity of a transfer as regards the creditors of the company, if the company has assented to it (b). So, it has been held that the provisions of a railway Act which placed the management of the company's affairs in the hands of a certain number of directors, were intended for the protection of the shareholders merely, and that it was not open to a stranger to object that they had not been complied with (c). The 153rd section of the Companies Act of 1862, which declares " void " every transfer of shares in a company which is being wound up, unless the Court otherwise orders, was held not to prevent a broker who had bought and paid for shares in a company so situated from recovering from his principal the money so paid (d).

(a) *Ogden v. Benas*, L. R. 9 C. P. 513.

(c) *Thames Haven Co. v. Rose*, 4 M. & Gr. 552.

(b) *Exp. Littledale*, L. R. 9 Ch. 257.

(d) *Chapman v. Shepherd*, L. R. 2 C. P. 228.

The Bankruptcy Act of 1869, which enacts (s. 23) that the trustee in bankruptcy may disclaim any interest of the bankrupt, and that the property disclaimed is to be deemed surrendered on the day of the adjudication, was held to be limited to the relief of the bankrupt and the trustee in bankruptcy from liability; but not to affect the rights and liabilities of the lessor and original lessee or underlessee (a). The 38th section of the Company's Act of 1867, which requires that every prospectus shall specify all contracts entered into by the company or by its promoters, before the issue of the prospectus, and declares every prospectus which does not specify them, fraudulent on the part of the promoters and directors who knowingly issued it, as regards persons taking shares, is, literally, wide enough to include every contract made by a promoter even regarding his own private affairs; but it was limited in construction to the object of the Act, which was the protection of shareholders. It was held, therefore, to include only such contracts as were calculated to influence persons in applying for shares (b); but not to create any duty towards bondholders (c).

So, the Stamp Acts, which enacted that un-

(a) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71; (b) *Twycross v. Grant*, 2 C. Smyth v. North, L. R. 7 Ex. P. D. 469.

242; *Exp. Walton*, 17 Ch. D. (c) *Cornell v. Hay*, L. R. 8. 746; *E. and W. I. Dock Co. v.* C. P. 328.

Hill, 9 App. Cas. 448.

stamped documents should not be pleaded or given in evidence, or be available in law or equity, were held to mean only that such documents should be unavailable for the purpose of recovering any debt or property ; but not to extend to cases where the validity of the document was impugned on the ground of fraud or illegality (*a*). So, the 30 Vict. c. 23, s. 7, which invalidates all contracts of sea assurance unless expressed in a policy, and (s. 9) prohibits pleading or giving in evidence any policy which is not stamped, does not prevent the admission of the slip in evidence, on a collateral question of fraud or misrepresentation (*b*).

In the same spirit, the operation of the Act 7 Anne, c. 12, which, with the view of securing the inviolability accorded to ambassadors by the law of nations, enacted that all processes whereby an ambassador or his servant might be arrested, or his goods seized, should be null and void, was held not to extend beyond what might be necessary for the protection of the rank, duties, and religion of the ambassador ; and not to protect his servant, who rented a house, part of which he let in lodgings, from having his goods taken by distress for non-payment of a parochial rate. Such a house was not

(*a*) *R. v. Hawkesworth*, 1 Comp. R. *v. Overton*, 1 Dears. T. R. 450 ; *R. v. Gompertz*, & P. 308.
 9 Q. B. 824 ; *Ponsford v. Walton*, L. R. 3 C. P. 167. (*b*) *Ionides v. The Pacific Insurance Co.*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 517.

necessary for the servant's residence merely ; and to extend the operation of the Act to such a case would have been to cover ground foreign to its scope and object (*a*).

(*a*) *Novello v. Toogood*, 1 B. & C. 554.

CHAPTER IV.

SECTION I.—CONSTRUCTION TO PREVENT EVASION.

It is the duty of the judge to make such construction as shall suppress all evasions for the continuance of the mischief (*a*). To carry out effectually the object of a statute, it must be so construed as to defeat all attempts to do or avoid in an indirect or circuitous manner that which it has prohibited or enjoined (*b*). In fraudem legis facit, qui, salvis verbis legis, sententiam ejus circumvenit (*c*); and a statute is understood as extending to all such circumventions, and rendering them unavailing. Quando aliquid prohibetur, prohibetur et omne per quod devenitur ad illud (*d*). When the acts of the parties are adopted for the purpose of effecting a thing which is prohibited, and the thing prohibited is in consequence effected, the parties have done that which they have purposely caused, though they may have done it indirectly (*e*). When the thing done

(*a*) *Magdalen College Case*, (*d*) 2 Inst. 48.

11 Rep. 71b.

(*e*) *Per Blackburn J. in*

(*b*) *Bac. Ab. Statute (J.)*; *Jeffries v. Alexander*, 31 L. J. Com. Dig. Parlm. (R.) 28. Ch. 14.

(*c*) 3 Dig 1, 3, 29.

is substantially that which was prohibited, it falls within the Act, simply because, according to the true construction of the statute, it is the thing thereby prohibited (*a*). Whenever Courts see such attempts at concealment, "they brush away the cobweb "varnish," and show the transaction in its true light (*b*). They see things as ordinary men do (*c*), and so see through them. Whatever might be the form or colour of the transaction, the law looks to the substance of it (*d*). For this purpose the Courts go behind the documents and formalities, and inquire into the real facts. They may, and therefore must, inquire into the real nature of that which was done. An Act is not to be evaded by putting forward documents which give a false description of the matter (*e*). In all such cases, it is, in truth, rather the particular transaction than the statute which is the subject of construction; and if it is found to be in substance within the statute, it is not suffered to escape from the operation of the law by means of the disguise under which its real character is masked.

Thus, when the Usury Act was in force, it was said that if the contract really was an usurious loan of

(*a*) *Per* Lord Cranworth in *ner v. Armstrong*, 3 Myl. & K. 45.
Philpott v. St. George's Hospital,
 6 H. L. 333.

(*b*) *Per* Wilmot C.J. in *Solarte v. Melville*, 1 Man. &

Collins v. Blantern, 2 Wils. Ry. 204.
 349. (*e*) *Re Watson*, 25 Q. B. D.

(*c*) *Per* Lord Brougham in *War-* 27; *Madell v. Thomas*, [1891]
 1 Q. B. 230.

money, the wit of man could not find a shift to take it out of the Act (*a*) ; and accordingly, transactions which were ostensibly a sale of land (*b*), of goods (*c*), or of stock (*d*), or a lease (*e*), or an agency (*f*), or a partnership (*g*), when in reality usurious loans, were held to fall within the Act. So, if a contract be a wager in substance, no matter how the end is brought about, it would be void, though the object were ever so cunningly concealed in the form given to the transaction (*h*). And whether a document ought to be registered under the Bills of Sale Acts depends not on its terms or form, but on the evidence as to the real nature of the transaction, as to the real intention of the parties. Thus, if A be the real owner of goods, and B the pretended owner, and B

(*a*) *Per* Lord Mansfield in *Floyer v. Edwards*, 1 Cowp. 114. (*f*) *Harris v. Boston*, 2 Camp. 348.

(*b*) *Doe v. Gooch*, 3 B. & A. 664 ; *Doe v. Chambers*, 4 Camp. 1. (*g*) *Enderby v. Gilpin*, 5 Moo. 571.

(*c*) *Floyer v. Edwards*, *ubi sup.* ; *Davis v. Hardacre*, 2 Camp. 375 ; *Harvey v. Archbold*, 3 B. & C. 626. (*h*) *Grizewood v. Blane*, 11 C. B. 538. *Comp. Re Phillips*, 30 L. J. Bkcy. 1 ; *per Wilde B.* in *Jeffries v. Alexander*, 8 H. L. 594 ; *Thacker v. Hardy*, 4

(*d*) *Tate v. Wellings*, 3 T. R. 531 ; *Boldero v. Jackson*, 11 East, 612 ; *White v. Wright*, 3 B. & C. 273. Q. B. D. 685 ; *Read v. Anderson*, 13 Q. B. D. 779 ; *Evasion of Truck Acts*, *Gould v. Haynes*, 59 L. J. M. C. 9.

(*e*) *Bedo v. Sanderson*, Cro. Jac. 440 ; *Jestons v. Brooks*, 2 Cowp. 793. See *Higginson v. Simpson*, 2 C. P. D. 76.

by a document purports to let the goods to A with liberty to B in a certain event to seize, this may be construed as a license by A, the real owner, to B. If it be found as a fact that it was so given, then however absolute in form the document may be, it comes within the operation of the Act; and, if it be not registered, it is void (a). An Act which prohibited under a penalty the performance of plays without license, would extend to a performance where the actors did not come on the stage, but acted in a chamber below it, and their figures were reflected by mirrors so as to appear to the spectators to be on the stage (b). Lord Campbell's Act, which requires, under certain circumstances, the insertion of a full apology in a newspaper for a libel, would not be complied with, if the apology, however suitable in its terms, was printed in such type or in such a part of the paper as would be likely to escape the attention of ordinary readers (c). An assignment of leaseholds to a trustee with the object of protecting the mortgagee of them from liability to the covenants, after the trustee in bankruptcy had disclaimed, was treated as an attempt to evade the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, and therefore as a sham and void (d). The

(a) 41 & 42 Vict. c. 31, s. S. 680.

4; 45 & 46 Vict. c. 43, ss. 3, (c) 6 & 7 Vict. c. 96, s. 2;
9; *Beckett v. Tower Assets* *Lafone v. Smith*, 3 H. & N. 735.
Co., [1891] 1 Q. B. 638. (d) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 52, s.

(b) 6 & 7 Vict. c. 68, s. 2; 55, sub-s. 6; *Re Smith*, 25 Q.
Day v. Simpson, 18 C. B. N. B. D. 536.

Act of 1854 which required the registration of bills of sale of personal chattels, was held to extend to agreements for a bill of sale, constituting an equitable assignment (*a*). And where the grantor of a bill of sale of furniture remained in possession as the servant of the grantee, with leave to use the furniture as part of his salary, it was held that the grantee was not in possession by his servant, but that the grantor was in possession within the meaning, for the case was within the mischief, of the Act (*b*). The Acts which protected the monopoly of the Bank of England by prohibiting bodies of more than six persons "to borrow, "owe, or take up money on their bills or notes, payable at less than six months from the borrowing," were construed to make it illegal for such a body of bankers to accept a customer's bill at less than six months; for the effect of such a transaction would admit of competition with the Bank of England by the issue of bills and notes (*c*). And they were

- (*a*) 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36, and Ex. D. 24; *Re Watson*, 25 Q. 45 & 46 Vict. c. 43; Exp. B. D. 27; *Madell v. Thomas*, Mackay, L. R. 8 Ch. 643; Ed- [1891] 1 Q. B. 230; *Cochrane v. Edwards*, 2 Ch. D. 291; *Brantom v. Griffiths*, 2 C. P. D. 212; Exp. Odell, 10 Ch. D. 76; but comp. *Allsopp v. Day*, 7 H. & N. 457; *Byerley v. Prevost*, L. R. 6 C. P. 144; *Marsden v. Meadows*, 7 Q. B. D. 80; *Woodgate v. Godfrey*, 5
- Ex. D. 24*; *Re Watson*, 25 Q. B. D. 27; *Madell v. Thomas*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 230; *Cochrane v. Matthews*, 10 Ch. D. 80n.
- (*b*) *Pickard v. Marriage*, 1 Ex. D. 364; Exp. *Lewis*, L. R. 6 Ch. 626. See another example in *Stallard v. Marks*, 3 Q. B. D. 412.
- (*c*) *Anderson v. Bank of England*, 3 Bing. N. C. 589.

also held to prohibit a joint stock bank from engaging with a foreign bank that their manager, who was not a partner, should accept the bills of the foreign bank, and that they should provide funds for their payment (a). All such transactions were held to come more or less directly within the prohibition to "owe, "borrow, or take up money on bills or notes" (b). Issuing shares at a discount so as to render the shareholder liable for a smaller sum than that fixed for the value of the shares by the memorandum of association is ultra vires and invalid, for it would make a statutory requirement an empty form (c).

A tenant who covenanted not to assign his lease without his landlord's license, would be held to have broken his covenant by giving a warrant of attorney to confess judgment, if he gave it for the express purpose of enabling the judgment creditor to take the lease in execution; for this was, in effect and intention, an assignment of the lease (d). The transaction would be unobjectionable if divested of the intent to break the covenant (e). A similar warrant of attorney, given by an insolvent to enable a favoured creditor to take his goods in execution,

(a) *Booth v. Bank of England*, 7, 8, 12; *Re Almada Co.*, 38 7 C. & F. 509; *Exp. Randleson*, Ch. D. 415.

1 Mont. & M'Arth. 86.

(d) *Doe v. Carter*, 8 T. R.

(b) See also *O'Connor v.* 300.

Bradshaw, 5 Ex. 882.

(e) *Id.* 57. See *Bills v.*

(c) 25 & 26 Vict. c. 89, ss. *Smith*, 6 B. & S. 314.

would, in the same way, be within the provisions against fraudulent transfers of property (a).

The Mortmain Act of Geo. II., which prohibits the disposition to a charity, of land, or money to be laid out in the purchase of land, otherwise than by deed executed twelve months before the donor's death, to be enrolled within six months from its execution, and to take effect immediately, and without power of revocation or any reservation for the benefit of the donor, has frequently been the subject of such experiments. Thus, a bequest of money to the committee of a school, on condition that they would provide land for a charitable purpose, would fall within the Act; for such a transaction differs but in name from a purchase of the land and a devise of it (b). The testator did not, indeed, directly devise the land; but he gave money in consideration of land being given to a charity, which was substantially the same thing. So, if money were bequeathed to be laid out in building houses, where there was no land already in mortmain (c) to build them on, such a bequest would be construed as an indirect instruction to purchase land for the purpose (d). Where the owner

(a) *Sharpe v. Thomas*, 6 Bing. 416; *Croft v. Lumley*, 6 H. L. 349.

(b) See 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, s. 92; *Exp. Griffith*, 23 Ch. D. 69. (c) *Comp. Brodie v. Chandos*, 1 Bro. C. C. 444n.; and *Pritchard v. Arbouin*, 3 Russ. 456.

(d) *Atty.-Gen. v. Davies*, 9 Ves. 535; and see the judgment of Lord Cranworth in *Philpott v. St. George's Hospital*, 6 H. L. 2

of land, with the object of evading the statutes, executed a deed, which he kept concealed till his death, whereby he covenanted that he or his executors would pay to certain trustees for certain charitable purposes, a large sum of money, which would necessarily have to be raised out of his land, this was held to fall within the prohibition of the statute. The creation of a fictitious debt on which execution might issue, and the land be taken, was but an indirect mode of making a gift of the land (*a*).

So, a settlement, under the Poor law, by renting a tenement, was not obtained where the renting was colourable or fraudulent (*b*). It has been held that where a woman pregnant with an illegitimate child was fraudulently removed by the officers of the parish in which she was settled (*c*) to another parish, the child's place of settlement was not the parish where it was born, but that in which it would, but for the fraudulent removal, have been born (*d*). Indeed, it has been held that where an unmarried woman was removed to a parish by order of justices, and gave birth to a

Keen, 172 ; Giblett *v.* Hobson, 180 ; *R. v. St. Sepulchre*, Id. 924.
3 Myl. & K. 517. (c) See *R. v. Astley*, 4 Doug.

(a) Jeffries *v.* Alexander, 8 389.
H. L. 594 ; and *per Cur.* in (d) *Masters v. Child*, 3 Salk.
Attree v. Hawe, 9 Ch. D. 337 ; 66 ; *Tewkesbury v. Twynning*, 2
comp. *Re Robson*, 19 Ch. D. Bott. 3 ; comp. *R. v. Mattersey*,
156. 4 B. & Ad. 211 ; *R. v. Halifax*,

(b) *R. v. Woodland*, 1 T. R. 2 B. & Ad. 211 ; and *R. v.*
261 ; *R. v. Tillingham*, 1 B. & Ad. Birmingham, 8 B. & C. 29.

child there, and the order was quashed on appeal, the child was to be regarded as born in the parish where he ought to have been, and not where he actually was born (*a*). Where a woman, after failing to obtain a bastardy order where she resided, removed to a neighbouring borough for the avowed purpose of trying to get the order there; it was held that the justices of the borough had no jurisdiction to make it, under the Act which gives such authority to justices of the place where the woman "resides" (*b*). It would have been different if she had not removed for the sole object of getting into another jurisdiction (*c*).

On this general principle, the Courts have repeatedly refused to review by mandamus, or otherwise, the proceedings of an inferior Court, if within its jurisdiction, when the writ of certiorari has been taken away (*d*). Where the payment of rates is made a matter of personal qualification, the Act would not be complied with if they were paid by another person on behalf of him who claims the qualification (*e*).

(*a*) *Much Waltham v. Peram*, 2 Salk. 474; *Westbury v. Coston*, Id. 532; *R. v. Great Salkeld*, 6 M. & S. 408.

(*b*) *R. v. Myott*, 32 L. J. M. C. 138; *R. v. Allendale*, 3 T. R. 382, 385.

(*c*) *R. v. Hughes, Dears. & B.* 188; *Massey v. Burton*, 2 H. & N. 527.

(*d*) *R. v. Yorkshire*, 5 B. & Ad. 1003, and 1 A. & E. 563; *R. v. Eaton*, 2 T. R. 472.

(*e*) *R. v. Bridgnorth*, 10 A. & E. 66; *Durant v. Withers*, L. R. 9 C. P. 257. But comp. *R. v. Bridgewater*, 3 T. R. 550; *R. v. Weobley*, 2 East, 68; *Hughes v. Chatham*, 5 M. & Gr. 54; *R. v. S. Kilvington*, 5

It is, however, essential not to confound what is actually or virtually prohibited or enjoined by the language, with what is really beyond the purview, though it may be within the policy, of the Act; for it is only to the former case that the principle under consideration applies, and not to cases where, however manifest the object of the Act may be, the language is not co-extensive with it. An Act of Parliament is always subject to evasion in this sense; for there is no obligation not to do what the Legislature has not really prohibited, and it is not evading an Act to keep outside of it (*a*). Thus, hiring for a few days less than a year, though avowedly for the purpose of preventing the servant from acquiring a settlement, was not regarded as any evasion of the Act, which gave a settlement on a year's service (*b*). Where a testator after devising a piece of land in a certain hamlet in fee simple, directed that if any person should, within twelve months after the testator's decease, at his or her own expense, purchase and give a suitable piece of land for almshouses, the trustees of

Q. B. 216. See *Chinnery v. Etherington v. Wilson*, 1 Ch. Evans, 11 H. L. 115, and D. 160; and *Pender v. Lushington*, 6 Ch. D. 70; *Snow Harlock v. Ashberry*, 19 Ch. D. 539. *v. Hill*, 14 Q. B. D. 588;

(*a*) See *per* Lord Selborne *Davies v. Stephenson*, 24 Q. B. in *Macbeth v. Ashley*, L. R. D. 529.

2 Sc. App. 359. See *ex. gr.* (*b*) *R. v. Little Coggeshall*, 6 *Shepherd v. Hall*, 3 Camp. 180; M. & S. 264; *R. v. Mursley*, 1 *King v. Low*, 3 C. & P. 620; T. R. 694.

the will should pay a sum of money to the charity so instituted, but so that no part should be laid out in the purchase of land, it was held that the bequest was valid, and did not fall within the Mortmain Act (*a*). And again, where a testator devised land to two persons absolutely, and signed an unattested paper expressing a desire, with which they were unacquainted until after his death, that it should be applied to charitable purposes, it was held that the devise was valid, and did not fall within the Mortmain Act; for there was no binding trust for charitable purposes (*b*).

Although a beershop-keeper who is licensed to sell beer only to be drunk off the premises, evades the Act if he sells beer to be drunk on a bench which he provides for his customers close to his shop, the intention making it, virtually, a sale for consumption on the premises (*c*); a mere sale through a window, to a person who stood on the road outside, would not be an evasion, though the buyer drank the beer immediately on receiving it (*d*). The occupier of a field adjoining a turnpike does not evade, though he avoids payment of toll, by making a semicircular road between two gaps in his hedge, one on each

(*a*) *Philpott v. St. George's Hospital*, 6 H. L. 338; *Dent v. Allcroft*, 30 Beav. 335; and see *Edwards v. Hall*, 6 De G. M. & G. 74.

(*b*) *Wallgrave v. Tebbs*, 2 K. & J. 313.

(*c*) *Cross v. Watts*, 32 L. J. M. C. 73. See also *Brigden v. Heighes*, 1 Q. B. D. 330.

(*d*) *Deal v. Schofield*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 8; *Bath v. White*, 3 C. P. D. 175.

side of the toll bar, and driving by it instead of along that part of the highway which forms its chord (*a*). Nor does a shipowner evade harbour dues charged on goods landed in it, by landing his goods a few yards outside the boundary of the harbour (*b*).

An enactment which imposed a duty on legacies did not extend to a gift to take effect on the donor's death, made by a deed which contained a power of revoking the gift; though such a gift had all the essential incidents of a legacy (*c*). A statute which imposes a tax, indeed, is always construed strictly; but this decision shows that if the law closes only one of two doors, it is no evasion of it to use the other, which it has left open. So, the enactment that the sheriff shall retain for fourteen days the proceeds of goods sold in execution when exceeding £50, and, if he receives notice of the debtor's bankruptcy, shall pay them to the trustee in bankruptcy, would not prevent a creditor for more than £50 from signing judgment for less than that amount, though he did so avowedly to escape from the operation of the Act (*d*). An agreement that the rent of demised premises should be reduced when and as soon as the income tax was

(*a*) *Harding v. Headington*, & K. 32. See, however, 44 & L. R. 9 Q. B. 157; *Veitch v.* 45 Vict. c. 12, s. 38, and 52 & *Exeter*, 8 E. & B. 986. 53 Vict. c. 7, s. 11.

(*b*) *Wilson v. Robertson*, 4 (*d*) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, s. E. & B. 923. 87; *Exp. Reya*, 6 Ch. D. 332.

(*c*) *Tompson v. Browne*, 3 M. See *Exp. Abbott*, 15 Ch. D. 447.

abolished, was held not to fall within the prohibition in the Income Tax Act, of all contracts binding the tenant to pay the income tax without deducting it from his rent (*a*). A railway company, prevented from raising money by loan, may yet procure money by a sale of a portion of its rolling stock for the sum which it requires, retaining the stock by hiring it for a term, on payment of an annual sum which repays the purchase-money with interest (*b*).

A warrant of attorney which authorised the issue of a writ of sequestration on a rectory as often as an annuity granted by the incumbent was in arrear, would be invalid; for this would amount to a charging of a benefice to pay the annuity, contrary to the Act of the 13 Eliz. c. 20 (*c*). But where the warrant of attorney purported to be merely to secure the payment of an annuity mentioned in a bond which had been given for its payment, the Court refused to set aside the judgment entered up on the warrant, as it was not a charging of the benefice; although it appeared, by affidavit, that the object of the parties was, that the judgment should enable the annuitant to obtain a sequestration of the grantor's living, if the annuity should fall into arrear (*d*). The Act which required

(*a*) *Colbron v. Travers*, 12 C. B. N. S. 181; *Davies v. Fitton*, 2 Dr. & War. 225.

(*b*) *Yorkshire Railway Wagon Co. v. Maclure*, 21 Ch. D. 309.

(*c*) *Flight v. Salter*, 1 B. & Ad. 673; *Saltmarshe v. Hewett*, 1 A. & E. 812.

(*d*) *Colebrook v. Layton*, 4 B. & Ad. 578. *Comp. Doe v.*

that all bills of sale of personal chattels should be registered within twenty-one days from execution, on pain of being void against creditors, was held not to invalidate an arrangement by which a fresh bill of sale was to be given every twenty-one days, and none were to be registered until the debtor got into difficulties. Although such an arrangement was considered to be detrimental to the interests of the revenue, and to be calculated to defeat and delay creditors, and so was contrary to the general policy of the Act, since it left the debtor apparently the owner of property which he had transferred; it was held not to be prohibited by its language, and the last bill of sale, which was duly registered, was held valid against an execution creditor (*α*).

It has been found necessary to suffer an evasion or breach of an Act, where intolerable inconvenience would otherwise result. Though the 33 & 34 Vict. c. 97, s. 17, enacts that no document which is not properly stamped shall be receivable in evidence, and (s. 54) that a person who receives a bill of exchange or cheque not duly stamped cannot recover upon it, or make it available for any purpose whatever; it has been held that if the cheque sued upon has a stamp

Carter, 8 T. R. 300, and Jeffries
v. Alexander, 8 H. L. 594, sup.,
pp. 157, 164.

(*α*) Smale v. Burr, L. R. 8

C. P. 64. Comp. Exp. Cohen,
L. R. 7 Ch. 20; Exp. Stevens,
L. R. 20 Eq. 786; Ramsden v.

Lupton, L. R. 9 Q. B. 17.

sufficient on its face, the fact that it was post-dated to the knowledge of the holder, and so was not sufficiently stamped, did not affect its admissibility in evidence; on the ground that a different decision would have introduced the greatest difficulty in the administration of justice, involving an interruption of the trial by collateral inquiries as to facts accompanying the giving of the instrument (*a*).

SECTION II.—CONSTRUCTION TO PREVENT ABUSE OF POWERS.

On the same general principle, enactments which confer powers are so construed as to meet all attempts to abuse them, either by exercising them in cases not intended by the statute, or by refusing to exercise them when the occasion for their exercise has arisen (*b*). Though the act done was ostensibly in execution of the statutory power, and within its letter, it would nevertheless be held not to come within the power, if done otherwise than honestly, and in the spirit of the enactment. For instance, the power given by Bankrupt Acts to a majority of creditors to make arrangements with their debtor, which were made by statute binding on the non-assenting minority, would not be

(*a*) *Gatty v. Fry*, 2 Ex. D. 715. But comp. *Clarke v. Roche*, 265. See *per* Blackburn J. in 3 Q. B. D. 170.
Austin v. Bunyard, 6 B. & S. 687; *Royal Bank of Scotland v. Tottenham*, [1894] 2 Q. B. 265. (*b*) See *per* Turner L.J. in *Biddulph v. St. George's* Vestry, 33 L. J. Ch. 411.

validly exercised so as to have this binding effect, if the conduct of the majority were tainted with fraud ; or even if, from motives of benevolence, the majority had agreed to a composition disproportioned to the assets (*a*). So, the creditor who voted for a composition with his debtor under the 126th section of the Bankruptcy Act of 1869, was bound to vote *bonâ fide* for the benefit of the creditors ; and if it appeared that he gave his vote for the benefit of the debtor, and not for that of the creditors, it would have been rejected (*b*). Malpractice by the debtor in obtaining a single vote sufficed to vitiate a creditors' resolution for liquidation by arrangement under the Bankruptcy Act of 1869 (*c*).

Where, as in a multitude of Acts, something is left to be done according to the discretion of the authority on whom the power of doing it is conferred, the discretion must be exercised honestly and in the spirit of the statute, otherwise the act done would not fall within the statute. "According to his discretion," means, it has been said, according to the rules of reason and justice, not private opinion (*d*) ; according

(*a*) Exp. Cowen, L. R. 2 Ch. 563, see *per* Lord Cairns, 570 ; Exp. Russell, L. R. 10 Ch. 255 ; *Re* Page, 2 Ch. D. 323 ; *Re* Terrell, 4 Ch. D. 293 ; Exp. Aaronson, 7 Ch. D. 713 ; Exp. Ball, 51 L. J. Ch. 911.

(*b*) Exp. Cobb, L. R. 8 Ch. 727.

(*c*) *Re* Baum, 7 Ch. D. 719.

(*d*) *Rooke's Case*, 5 Rep. 100a ; *Keighley's Case*, 10 Rep. 140a ; *Lee v. Bude R. Co.*, L. R. 6 C. P. 576, *per* Willes J.

to law and not humour; it is to be, not arbitrary, vague and fanciful, but legal and regular (*a*); to be exercised not capriciously but on judicial grounds and for substantial reasons (*b*). And it must be exercised within the limits to which an honest man competent to the discharge of his office ought to confine himself (*c*); that is, within the limits and for the objects intended by the Legislature. These dicta may be summed up in the statement of Lord Esher that the discretion must be exercised without taking into account any reason which is not a legal one. If people who have to exercise a public duty by exercising their discretion take into account matters which the Courts consider not to be proper for the guidance of their discretion, then in the eye of the law they have not exercised their discretion (*d*).

Thus, it was long ago settled that the power given by the 43 Eliz. to the overseers of parishes to raise a poor rate by taxation of the parishioners in such competent sums as they thought fit, did not authorise an arbitrary rate on each parishioner, but required that the rates should be equal and proportionate to the

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Per</i> Lord Mansfield in <i>R. v. Wilkes</i>, 4 Burr. 2527; and <i>per</i> Lord Halsbury L.C. in <i>Sharp v. Wakefield</i>, [1891] A. C. 173.</p> <p>(<i>b</i>) <i>Per</i> Jessel M.R. in <i>Re Taylor</i>, 4 Ch. D. 160; and <i>per</i> Lord Blackburn in <i>Doherty v.</i></p> | <p>Allman, 3 App. 728.</p> <p>(<i>c</i>) <i>Per</i> Lord Kenyon in <i>Wilson v. Rastall</i>, 4 T. R. 757; <i>R. v. Audly</i>, Salk. 526; <i>R. v. Wavell</i>, 1 Doug. 115.</p> <p>(<i>d</i>) <i>R. v. St. Pancras</i>, 24 Q. B. D. at p. 375.</p> |
|--|---|

means of the contributors (*a*). So, the Highway Act, 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 50, which provided that if any complaint was made against the road surveyor's accounts, the justices at special highway sessions should hear it, and "make such order thereon as to them should seem meet," would not authorise them to allow illegal expenses, such as a charge for the use of the surveyor's horses, contrary to s. 46, which are expressly forbidden to be incurred at all (*b*). So, overseers, who are required by the 3 & 4 Vict. c. 61, to certify whether applicants for beer licenses are real residents and ratepayers of the parish, are not entitled to refuse the certificate on the ground that in their opinion there are already too many public-houses, or that the beer-shop is not required. They have no right to shut their eyes to the facts, and to refuse to certify, when they are satisfied that the applicant possesses the qualifications required by the Act (*c*). Under an enactment that no license should be refused by justices except on one or more of four specified grounds, it was held that justices, in refusing, were bound to state on which of the grounds they based their refusal, as otherwise they might, in abuse of their powers,

(*a*) *Eably's Case*, 2 Bulstr. 354; *Marshall v. Pitman*, 9 Bing. 595. See *Jones v. Mersey Docks*, 35 L. J. M. C. 1; and *Whitchurch v. Fulham Board*, L. R. 1 Q. B. 233.

(*b*) *Barton v. Pigott*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 86.

(*c*) *R. v. Withyam*, 2 Com. Law Rep. 1657; comp. *R. v. Kensington*, 12 Q. B. 654.

refuse on other grounds than those to which they were limited (a). The power to take certain lands for the purpose of their undertaking, given to railway companies, constitutes them sole judges as to whether they will take the lands, but they must act *bonâ fide* for the purposes authorised by the Act, and not for a collateral purpose (b).

Although where the discretion has been settled by practice, it seems right that this should not be departed from without strong reason (c); yet in cases where a statute confers a discretionary power, an exercise of it in the fetters of self-imposed rules of practice, purporting to bind in all cases, would not be within the Act (d). Thus, where an Act gave the Court of Quarter Sessions power, if it thought fit, to give costs in every poor law appeal, it would be bound to exercise a fair and honest discretion in each case, and would not be entitled to govern itself by a general resolution, or rule of practice, to give nominal costs in all cases (e); for this would be in effect to repeal the provision of the Act. So, a licensing Act, which empowered

(a) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 27, s. 8; (c) 2 Inst. 298. See *R. v. Sykes*, 1 Q. B. D. 52; *Chapman*, 8 C. & P. 558.
Exp. Smith, 3 Q. B. D. 374. See (d) See *Atty.-Gen. v. Emerson*,
Exp. Gorman, [1894] A. C. 23. 24 Q. B. D. 56.

(b) *Stockton Ry. Co. v. Brown*, (e) *R. v. Merioneth*, 6 Q. B. 163; *R. v. Glamorganshire*, 1
 9 H. L. C. 246; *Lewis v. Weston Loc. Bd.*, 40 Ch. D. 55; L. M. & P. 336; *comp.*
Stroud v. Wandsworth Board of Freeman v. Read, 9 C. B. N. S.
 Works, [1894] 2 Q. B. 1. 301.

justices to grant licenses to innkeepers and others, to sell liquors, as in the exercise of their discretion they deemed proper, would not justify a general resolution to refuse licenses in a certain locality (a), or to persons who did not consent to take out an excise license for the sale of spirits, in addition to the license for the sale of beer (b).

So, where a similar Act, after fixing the hours within which intoxicating liquors might be sold, authorised the licensing justices to alter the hours in any particular locality, within the district, requiring other hours; it was held that they had no right to alter the time in every case by virtue of a general resolution to which they had come (c). And though their resolution was limited to a portion of the locality, yet as this portion comprised every licensed house of the whole district, the limitation was regarded as a mere attempt to evade the Act. The statute required them to decide, in the honest and bonâ fide exercise of their judgment, what particular localities required other hours for opening and closing, than those specified; and they were bound to satisfy themselves that the special circumstances of the particular locality, which they took out of the general rule laid down by Parliament, required that the exception should be made (d).

(a) *R. v. Walsall*, 3 Com. L. R. 100.

(b) *R. v. Sylvester*, 2 B. & S. 322.

(c) *Macbeth v. Ashley*, L. R. 2 Sc. App. 352.

(d) See the judgment of Lord Selborne, Id. 359.

The statute had laid down a general rule, and permitted an exception; but here the exception had swallowed up the rule; and that which might fairly have been an exercise of discretion, became no exercise of the kind of discretion meant by the Act (a).

(a) *Per* Lord Cairns, L. R. 2 Sc. App. 357.

CHAPTER V.

SECTION I.—PRESUMPTIONS AGAINST OUSTING ESTABLISHED, AND CREATING NEW JURISDICTIONS.

It is, perhaps, on the general presumption against an intention to disturb the established state of the law, or to interfere with the vested rights of the subject (*a*), that the strong leaning now rests against construing a statute as ousting or restricting the jurisdiction of the Superior Courts; although it may owe its origin to the pecuniary interests of the Judges in former times, when their emoluments depended mainly on fees (*b*). It is supposed that the Legislature would not make so important an innovation, without a very explicit expression of its intention. It would not be inferred, for instance, from the grant of a jurisdiction to a new tribunal over certain cases, that the Legislature intended to deprive the Superior Court of the jurisdiction which it already possessed over the same cases.

(*a*) See *Jacobs v. Brett*, L. R. 20 Eq. 1. *Scott v. Avery*; *Tredwen v. Holman*, 1 H. & C. 72;

(*b*) *Per* Lord Campbell in *Edwards v. Aberayron Insurance Soc.*, 1 Q. B. D. 563; *Dawson v. Fitzgerald*, 1 Ex. D. 257. So in construing contracts,

Thus, an Act which provided that if any question arose upon taking a distress, it should be determined by a commissioner of taxes, would not thereby take away the jurisdiction of the Superior Court to try an action for an illegal distress (*a*). Nor would that Court be ousted of its preventive jurisdiction to stop by injunction the misapplication of poor rates, by the power given to the poor law commissioners by statute to determine the propriety of all such expenditure (*b*). It did not follow in either case, that because authority was given to the commissioners, it was taken away from the Court.

Acts which give justices and other inferior tribunals jurisdiction in certain cases, not only are understood, in general, when silent on the subject, as not affecting the power of control and supervision which the Superior Court exercises over the proceedings of such tribunals; but they are even strictly construed when their language is doubtful. Thus, enactments to the effect that "no Court shall intermeddle" in the cases (*c*), or that the case shall be "heard and finally determined" below (*d*), would not be construed as

(*a*) 43 Geo. III. c. 99; *v. Whitmore*, 1 Hem. & M. Shaftesbury *v. Russell*, 1 B. & 576.

C. 666; see also *Rochdale Canal Co. v. King*, 14 Q. B. 1041. (*c*) *R. v. Moreley*, 2 Burr.

122. (*d*) *R. v. Plowright*, 3 Mod.

(*b*) *Atty.-Gen. v. Southampton*, 17 Sim. 6. See *Birley v. Chorlton*, 3 Beav. 499; *Smith* 95; 2 Hawk. P. C. c. 27, s. 23. See *Jacobs v. Brett*, L. R. 20 Eq. 1; *Chambers v. Green*, Id.

prohibiting such interference ; and enactments which expressly provide that such proceedings shall not be removed by certiorari to the Superior Court have no application when the lower tribunal has overstepped the limits of its jurisdiction in making the order (*a*), or is not duly constituted (*b*) ; for the prohibition obviously applied only to cases which have been entrusted to the lower jurisdiction ; or where the party who obtained the order, obtained it by fraud (*c*).

The saying has been attributed to Lord Mansfield that nothing but express words can take away the jurisdiction of the Superior Courts (*d*) ; but it may certainly be taken away also by implication (*e*). Thus, a provision that if any dispute arises between a society and any of its members it shall be lawful to refer it to arbitration, ousts the jurisdiction of the Courts

552 ; *Hawes v. Paveley*, 1 C. P. D. 418 ; *Bridge v. Branch*, Id. 633 ; *Chadwick v. Ball*, 14 Q. B. D. 855.

(*a*) *R. v. Derbyshire*, 2 Keny. 299 ; *R. v. Somersetshire*, 5 B. & C. 816 ; *R. v. St. Albans*, 22 L. J. M. C. 142 ; *R. v. Wood*, 5 E. & B. 49 ; *R. v. S. Wales R. Co.*, 13 Q. B. 988 ; *Re Penny*, 7 E. & B. 660 ; *R. v. Hyde*, 7 E. & B. 859n ; *Exp. Bradlaugh*, 3 Q. B. D. 509.

(*b*) *R. v. Cheltenham*, 1 Q. B. 467.

(*c*) *R. v. Cambridge*, 4 A. & E. 121, *per* Lord Denman ; *R. v. Gillyard*, 12 Q. B. 527 ; *Colonial Bank v. Willan*, L. R. 5 P. C. 417.

(*d*) *R. v. Abbot*, Doug. 553.

(*e*) *Per* Ashurst J., in *Cates v. Knight*, 3 T. R. 442, and *Shipman v. Henbest*, 4 T. R. 116 ; *per* Jessel M.R. in *Jacobs v. Brett*, L. R. 20 Eq. 6 ; *per* Pollock B. in *Oram v. Brearey*, 2 Ex. D. 346 ; and see *Chadwick v. Ball*, 14 Q. B. D. 855, which overrules the last case.

over such disputes (a). It is obvious that the provision, from its nature, would be superfluous and useless, if it did not receive a construction which made it compulsory, and not optional, to proceed by arbitration. On similar grounds it was held that no action lay in the Superior Courts on a County Court judgment. The provisions made by the County Court Act for enforcing such judgments would have been defeated, if the jurisdiction of the Superior Courts to entertain such an action had not been ousted (b).

Where an Act vested in the trustees of a loan society all its money and effects, and the right of bringing and defending actions touching the property and rights of the society, and, after enabling them to lend money under certain circumstances, and to take notes for such loans in the name of their treasurer for the time being, to secure repayment, authorised a justice, at the suit of the treasurer, to enforce pay-

- (a) *Crisp v. Bunbury*, 8 Bing. 394; and see *Marshall v. Nicholls*, 18 Q. B. 882; *Boylefield v. Porter*, 13 East, 200; *Exp. Payne*, 5 D. & L. 679; *Armitage v. Walker*, 2 K. & J. 211; *Reeves v. White*, 17 Q. B. 995; *Huckle v. Wilson*, 2 C. P. D. 410; *Wright v. Monarch Investment Soc.*, 5 Ch. D. 726; *Hack v. London Provident Bldg. Soc.*, 23 Ch. D. 103; *Municipal Bldg. Soc. v. Kent*, 9 App. Cas. 260. *Comp. Rochdale Canal v. King*, 14 Q. B. 122.
- (b) 9 & 10 Vict. c. 95; *Berkeley v. Elderkin*, 1 E. & B. 805; see *Austin v. Mills*, 9 Ex. 288; *Moreton v. Holt*, 10 Ex. 707. *Comp. Edwards v. Coombe*, L. R. 7 C. P. 519.

ment by distress; it was held that the treasurer was limited to that remedy (*a*). He had no rights but such as the statute gave him, and therefore could not sue except in the manner directed (*b*). But another Court held that the trustees might sue on such notes in the Superior Courts (*c*). Where an Act imposed penalties and took away the certiorari; and a subsequent one, after increasing the penalties and extending the restrictions of the first, provided that all "the powers, provisions, exemptions, matters and things" contained in the earlier should, except as they were varied, be as effectual for carrying out the latter Act as if re-enacted in it; it was held that the clause which took away the certiorari was incorporated in the new Act, and consequently that the jurisdiction of the Superior Courts was ousted (*d*).

Where, indeed, a new duty or cause of action is created by statute, and a special jurisdiction out of the course of the common law is prescribed, there is no ouster of the jurisdiction of the ordinary Courts, for they never had any. Thus, where an Act created penalties of £50 and £10; and, after enacting that the former should be recovered in the Superior Courts, authorised justices to impose the latter, with

- | | |
|---|--|
| (a) See also <i>Dundalk R. Co. v. Tapster</i> , 1 Q. B. 667. | L. R. 10 C. P. 679. |
| <i>Mulkern v. Lord</i> , 4 A. C. 182. | (c) <i>Albon v. Pyke</i> , 4 M. & Gr. 421. |
| (b) <i>Timms v. Williams</i> , 3 Q. B. 413; <i>Prentice v. London</i> , | (d) <i>R. v. Fell</i> , 1 B. & Ad. 380. |

powers of mitigation; it was held that the Superior Courts had no jurisdiction in respect of the lower penalty (a). Where it was enacted, by the Metropolis Management Act, that the owners of the houses which formed a street should pay the vestry the estimated cost of paving it, and that the amount should, in case of dispute, be ascertained by, and recovered before justices; it was held that the pecuniary obligation and the mode of enforcing it were so indissolubly united, that no action lay against a householder for his contribution (b).

The Nuisances Removal Act, 11 & 12 Vict. c. 123, which enacts that if the owner of the offensive premises does not remove the nuisance, the guardians may do so, and that the costs and expenses incurred by them shall be deemed money paid for the use of the owner, and may be recovered as such by them in the County Court, or before two justices, was held to give exclusive jurisdiction to those tribunals (c).

As it is presumed that the Legislature would not effect a measure of so much importance as the ouster or restriction of the jurisdiction of the Superior Court without an explicit expression of its intention, so it is

(a) *Cates v. Knight*, 3 T. R. 442. *Comp. Shipman v. Henbeet*, 4 T. R. 109; *Leigh v. Kent*, 3 T. R. 362; *Balls v. Attwood*, 1 H. Bl. 546.

St. Pancras v. Batterbury, 2 C. B. N. S. 477. See also *Blackburn v. Parkinson*, 1 E. & E. 71.

(c) *Hertford Union v. Kimp-*

ton, 11 Ex. 295.

equally improbable that it would create a new jurisdiction with less explicitness; and therefore a construction which would impliedly have this effect is to be avoided; especially when it would have the effect of depriving the subject of his freehold, or of any common law right, such as the right of trial by jury, or of creating an arbitrary procedure (*a*). It has been said that the words conferring such a jurisdiction must be clear and unambiguous (*b*); and that an inferior Court is not to be construed into a jurisdiction (*c*). An Act, for instance, which in providing that compensation should be made to all who sustained damage in carrying out certain works, enacted that "in case of dispute as to the amount," it should be settled by arbitration, would be confined strictly to cases where the amount only was in dispute, but would not authorise a reference to arbitration, where the liability to make any compensation was in dispute (*d*). However, effect must of course be given to the intention, where the Act, without conferring

(*a*) *Warwick v. White*, Bunb. 106; *Kite and Lane's Case*, 1 B. & C. 101, *per* Lord Tenterden; *R. v. Baines*, 2 Lord Raym. 1269, cited by Lord Denman, in *Fletcher v. Calthrop*, 6 Q. B. 891; *per* Best C.J. in *Looker v. Halcomb*, 4 Bing. 188. See *R. v. Cotton*, 1 E. & E. 203; *Exp. Story*, 3 Q. B. D. 166.

(*b*) *Per* Keating J. in *James v. S. W. R. Co.*, L. R. 7 Ex. 296.

(*c*) *Per* Fortescue J. in *Pierce v. Hopper*, 1 Stra. 260.

(*d*) *R. v. Metrop. Com. Sewers*, 1 E. & B 694. *Comp. Bradley v. Southampton Board*, 4 E. & B. 1014; *R. v. Burslem Board*, 1 E. & E. 1077.

jurisdiction in express terms, does so by plain and necessary implication. Thus, an Act which, without expressly empowering any tribunal to try the offence, imposed penalties on any person who exposed diseased animals for sale, unless he showed "to the justices before whom he is charged," that he was ignorant of the condition of the animals, and gave him an appeal if he felt aggrieved "by the adjudication of justices," was construed as plainly giving justices jurisdiction over the offence (a).

An enactment has been considered as granting jurisdiction by implication, in a remarkable manner. The 31 & 32 Vict. c. 71, after reciting that it was desirable that some County Courts should have Admiralty jurisdiction, and authorising the Queen in council to confer such jurisdiction on any of those Courts, empowered them to try certain classes of cases over which the Court of Admiralty had jurisdiction; directing the judge to transfer any case to the Admiralty, where the amount claimed exceeded £300, and giving also to the latter Court, in all cases, not only an appeal, but power to transfer to itself any suit instituted in the lower Court. By a supplementary Act passed in the following session (32 & 33 Vict. c. 51), the County Courts on which Admiralty

(a) Cullen v. Trimble, L. R. St. James, Westmr., 2 A. & E. 7 Q. B. 416; Johnson v. Colam, 241; R. v. Worcestershire, 3 L. R. 10 Q. B. 544. See Stable E. & B. 477.
v. Dixon, 6 East, 163; R. v.

jurisdiction had been thus conferred, were further authorised to try any claim arising out of any agreement made in relation to the use or hire of any ship, or in relation to the carriage of any goods in any ship, where the claim does not exceed £300. The Court of Admiralty had no jurisdiction over these cases before the Act was passed, but it followed that in thus giving the County Court this jurisdiction, the statute also gave, by mere implication, to the Admiralty Court, not only appellate, but original jurisdiction also; besides introducing the anomaly of dealing with small cases on different principles of law from large ones; while the apparent object of the enactments was merely to distribute the existing Admiralty jurisdiction (*a*).

SECTION II.—THE CROWN NOT AFFECTED IF NOT NAMED.

On probably similar ground rests the rule commonly stated in the form that the Crown is not bound by a statute unless named in it. It has been said that the law is *prima facie* presumed to be made for

(*a*) See *The Alina*, 5 Ex. D. 6 Q. B. 729; *The Dowse*, L. R. 227; *Everard v. Kendall*, L. R. 3 A. & E. 135; *Allen v. 5 C. P. 428*; *Simpson v. Blues*, Garbutt, 6 Q. B. D. 165; *R. L. R. 7 C. P. 290*; *Gunnestad v. City of London Judge*, [1892] *v. Price*, L. R. 10 Ex. 65; 1 Q. B. 273; *Pugsley & Co. v. Gaudet v. Brown*, L. R. 5 P. C. Ropkins & Co., [1892] 2 Q. B. 134, and the cases there cited. 184; *The Zeta*, [1893] A. C. 468. See also *Smith v. Brown*, L. R.

subjects only (*a*); at all events, the Crown is not reached except by express words, or by necessary implication, in any case where it would be ousted of an existing prerogative or interest (*b*). It is presumed that the Legislature does not intend to deprive the Crown of any prerogative, right or property, unless it expresses its intention to do so in explicit terms, or makes the inference irresistible. Where, therefore, the language of the statute is general, and in its wide and natural sense would divest or take away any prerogative or right from the Crown, it is construed so as to exclude that effect (*c*). When the King has any prerogative estate, right, title, or interest, he shall not be barred of them by the general words of an Act of Parliament (*d*). Thus, the compulsory clauses of Acts of Parliament, which authorise the taking of lands for railway or other purposes, such as are contained in the Lands Clauses Act of 1845, would not apply to Crown property, unless made so applicable in express terms or by necessary inference (*e*). Nor would a provision in a local Act ordering that the revenue of a corporation should be expended in a

- | | |
|--|---|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Willion v. Berkley</i> , Plowd. 236; <i>per Cur. in Atty.-Gen. v. Donaldson</i> , 10 M. & W. 117. | <i>Higgins v. Bambridge</i> , Willes, 241; <i>R. v. Wright</i> , 1 A. & E. 434. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Inst.</i> 191, <i>Atty.-Gen. v. Allgood, Parker</i> , 3; <i>Bac. Ab. Prerogative (E.)</i> 5 (<i>c</i>); <i>Co. Litt.</i> 43b; <i>Chit. Prerogative</i> , 382; <i>Ascough's Case</i> , Cro. Car. 526; | (<i>c</i>) <i>Bac. Ab. Prerog. (E.)</i> 5; <i>Crooke's Case</i> , Show. 208. |
| | (<i>d</i>) <i>Magdalen College Case</i> , 11 Rep. 74b. |
| | (<i>e</i>) 8 Vict. c. 18; <i>Re Cuckfield Board</i> , 19 Beav. 153. |

specified way, and "should not be applied for any "other purpose whatsoever," take away the duty of paying income tax to the Crown in the absence of express words to that effect (*a*). Again, as it is a prerogative of the Crown not to pay tolls or rates, or other burdens in respect of property, it was long since established that the Poor Act of Elizabeth, which authorises the imposition of a poor rate on every "inhabitant and occupier" of property in the parish, did not apply to the Crown, or to its direct and immediate servants, whose occupation is for the purposes of the Crown exclusively, and so is, in fact, the occupation of the Crown itself (*b*). Thus, property occupied by the servants of the Crown for public purposes, as the Post Office (*c*), the Horse Guards (*d*), the Admiralty (*e*), by a volunteer corps (*f*), and even by local police (*g*), by the judges, as lodgings at the assizes (*h*), by a county court (*i*), or for a

(*a*) *Mersey Docks v. Lucas*,
8 App. Cas. 891.

(*b*) 43 Eliz. c. 2. *Per Lord*
Westbury and Lord Cranworth
in *Mersey Docks Co. v. Cameron*,
11 H. L. 443; *Amherst v.*
Sommers, 2 T. R. 372; *R. v. Har-*
rogate, 15 Q. B. 1012; *R. v.*
St. Martin's, L. R. 2 Q. B. 493.

(*c*) *Smith v. Birmingham*, 7
E. & B. 483.

(*d*) *Amherst v. Sommers*, 2 T.
R. 372; *R. v. Jay*, 8 E. & B. 469.

(*e*) *R. v. Stewart*, 8 E. & B.
360.

(*f*) *Pearson v. Holborn Union*,
[1893] 1 Q. B. 389.

(*g*) *Lancashire v. Stretford*, E.
B. & E. 225. *Comp. Showers*
v. Chelmsford Union, [1891]
1 Q. B. 339.

(*h*) *Hodgson v. Carlisle*, 8 E.
& B. 116; *Coomber v. Berks*
Justices, 9 App. Cas. 61.

(*i*) *R. v. Manchester*, 3 E. &
B. 336.

sessions house (*a*), or a jail (*b*), or by the commissioners of public works and buildings in respect of a toll-bridge of which they were in occupation as servants of the Crown (*c*), was held exempt from poor rate (*d*). And property in the occupation of the sovereign would, also, not be liable to the common law burden of church rates or sewers rate; one reason assigned being that they could not be enforced (*e*). So, the Royal Dockyards at Deptford were held not assessable to the land tax (*f*). But if the tax attached to the land, and not to its owner or occupier, this rule would not be applicable; and land charged with it in the hands of a subject, would not become exempted on vesting in the sovereign (*g*).

(*a*) *Nicholson v. Holborn Assessment Committee*, 18 Q. B. D. 161.

(*b*) *R. v. Shepherd*, 1 Q. B. 170; *Beds v. St. Paul*, 7 Ex. 650; *Gambier v. Lydford*, 3 E. & B. 346. See the judgments of Blackburn J. and Lord Cranworth in *Mersey Docks Co. v. Cameron*, 11 H. L. 443; *Leith Comm. v. Poor Inspectors*, L. R. 1 Sc. Ap. 17; *Tunnicliffe v. Birkdale*, 20 Q. B. D. 450; *Bray v. Lancashire Justices*, 22 Q. B. D. 484; *Durham C.C. v. Chester-le-Street*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 330.

(*c*) *R. v. McCann*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 677.

(*d*) *Comp. Bute v. Grindall*, 1 T. R. 338; *R. v. Ponsonby*, 3 Q. B. 14; *R. v. Shee*, 4 Q. B. 2; *R. v. Stewart*, 8 E. & B. 360. See *Bro. Ab. Prerog. du Roy*, 112; *King v. Cook*, 3 T. R. 519; *Westover v. Perkins*, 2 E. & E. 57.

(*e*) *Per Dr. Lushington in Smith v. Keats*, 4 Hagg. 279; *Atty.-Gen. v. Donaldson*, 10 M. & W. 117.

(*f*) *Atty.-Gen. v. Hill*, 2 M. & W. 160.

(*g*) *Colchester v. Kewney*, L. R. 1 Ex. 368.

On the same general principle, the numerous Acts of Parliament which have, at various times, taken away the writ of certiorari, have always been held not to apply to the Crown (*a*). So, the 13 Geo. II. c. 18, s. 5, which limits the time for issuing that writ to six months from the date of the conviction (*b*), and the 12 & 13 Vict. c. 45, s. 5, which authorises the Quarter Sessions to give costs to the successful party in any appeal (*c*), do not apply to the Crown (the prosecutor), but only to the defendant. On the same ground, it would seem, the 4 Anne, c. 16, s. 4, which authorised a "defendant or tenant," with the leave of the Court, to plead several matters, was held not to extend to defendants in suits by or on behalf of the Crown (*d*); nor was the right of the Crown as to proceedings in the Exchequer touching the revenue or property of the Crown, affected by the County Court, or Judicature, or Companies (1862) Acts (*e*). The Statutes of Limitation (*f*) and Bankruptcy (*g*) have always been held

(*a*) See *ex. gr. R. v. Cumberland*, 3 B. & P. 354; *R. v. Allen*, 15 East, 333; *R. v. Bultbee*, 4 A. & E. 498.

(*b*) *R. v. Farewell*, 2 Stra. 1209; *R. v. James*, 1 East, 304n.; *R. v. Berkley*, 1 Ken. 80.

(*c*) *R. v. Beadle*, 26 L. J. M. C. 111.

(*d*) *Atty.-Gen. v. Allgood, Parker*, 1; *Atty.-Gen. v. Donaldson*, 7 M. & W. 422, 10 M. & W. 117; *R. v. Abp. of York*,

Willes, 533; *Hall v. Maule*, 4 A. & E. 283.

(*e*) *Mountjoy v. Wood*, 1 H. & N. 58; *Atty.-Gen. v. Constable*, 4 Ex. D. 172; *Atty.-Gen. v. Barker*, L. R. 7 Ex. 177; *Re Henley*, 9 Ch. D. 469.

(*f*) 11 Rep. 68b and 74b; *Lambert v. Taylor*, 4 B. & C. 138, 6th point; *Rustomjee v. R.*, 1 Q. B. D. 487, 2 Q. B. D. 69.

(*g*) *Exp. Russell*, 19 Ves. 163; *Exp. Postmaster-Gen.*, 10

not to bind the Crown ; so, also, the Debtors Act of 1869 (*a*), and the 5 & 6 Ed. VI. c. 16, against the sale of offices (*b*). The Interpleader Act was held not to apply to cases where the Crown was interested (*c*). The provision of the Statute of Frauds, which made writs of execution binding on the goods of the judgment debtor only from the time of the delivery of the writ to the sheriff for execution, was held not to affect the earlier rule of law (which bound the goods from the teste of the writ), where an extent was issued at the suit of the Crown (*d*). The Statute of Amendments of 4 Ed. III. st. 1, c. 6, which provided that clerical errors in records should be amended at once, without giving advantage to "the party" who had challenged the misprision, did not include the Crown; for, it was said, it had never been named "a party" in any Act of Parliament (*e*).

The Crown, however, is sufficiently named in a statute, within the meaning of the maxim, when an intention to include it is manifest. For instance, the 20 & 21 Vict. c. 43, which entitles (by s. 2) either party, after the hearing, by a justice, of "any in-

Ch. D. 595. See *Re Thomas*,
21 Q. B. D. 380.

(*a*) *Re Smith*, 2 Ex. D. 47.

(*b*) *Huggins v. Bambridge*,
Willes, 241.

(*c*) *Candy v. Maugham*, 6 M.
& Gr. 710.

(*d*) *R. v. Wynn*, Bunb. 39 ;
R. v. Mann, 2 Stra. 754 ; *Burden*

v. Kennedy, 3 Atk. 739 ; *Giles*
v. Grover, 1 Cl. & F. 72 ;
Uppom v. Sumner, 2 W. Bl.
1251 ; *Edwards v. R.*, 9 Ex.
628.

(*e*) *R. v. Tuchin*, 2 Lord
Raym. 1066. See also *Tobin*
v. R., 14 C. B. N. S. 505, and
Thomas v. R., L. R. 10 Q. B. 44.

“formation or complaint” which he has power to determine, to apply for a case for the opinion of one of the Superior Courts; and after authorising (by s. 4) the justice to refuse the application, if he deems it frivolous, provides that it shall never be refused when made by, or under the direction of the Attorney-General, and directs (by s. 6) the Superior Court, not only to deal with the decision appealed against, but to make such order as to costs as it deemed fit, was held by the Queen’s Bench to include the Crown, and to authorise an order against it for the payment of costs. The language of the 2nd section was wide enough to include the Crown; and as the 4th referred to the Crown as plainly as if it had spoken expressly of Crown cases, the language of the 6th authorising costs was construed as applying to such cases also, as well as to cases between subject and subject (*a*). But, although the Crown be named in some sections, this does not necessarily extend to it the operation of other parts of the statute (*b*).

It is said that the rule does not apply when the Act is made for the public good, the advancement of religion and justice, the prevention of fraud, or the suppression of injury and wrong (*c*); “for religion,

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Moore v. Smith</i>, 1 E. & E. 597. See <i>Theberge v. Laudry</i>, 2 A. C. 102, and <i>Cushing v. Dupuy</i>, 5 A. C. 409; <i>Tennant v. Union Bank of Canada</i>, [1894] A. C. 31.</p> | <p>(<i>b</i>) <i>Exp. Postmaster-General</i>, 10 Ch. D. 595; <i>Perry v. Eames</i>, [1891] 1 Ch. 658; <i>Wheaton v. Maple & Co.</i>, [1893] 3 Ch. 48.</p> <p>(<i>c</i>) <i>Case of Ecclesiastical persons</i>, 5 Rep. 14a, <i>Magdalen</i></p> |
|--|--|

"justice, and truth are the sure supporters of the "crowns and diadems of kings" (*a*); but it is probably more accurate to say that the Crown is not excluded from the operation of a statute where neither its prerogative, rights, nor property are in question. The Statute de donis (*b*); the Statute of Merton, against usury running against minors (*c*); the 22 Hen. III. c. 22 (Marlbridge), against distraining freeholders to produce their title deeds (*d*); the 32 Hen. VIII., concerning discontinuances (*e*); the 31 Eliz., against simony (*f*); the 13 Eliz. c. 10, respecting ecclesiastical leases (*g*), were held to apply to the Crown, though not named in them (*h*). So, the 11 Geo. IV. & 1 Will. IV. c. 70, which was passed for the better administration of justice, and enacted that writs of error upon judgments given in any of the Superior Courts, should be returned to the Exchequer Chamber, was held to apply to a judgment on an indictment (*i*), and on a petition of right (*j*); although the Crown was not named or referred to in the Act. No prerogative was affected by this construction (*k*).

College Case, 11 Rep. 70b-73a ;

R. v. Abp. of Armagh, Stra. 516 ;

Bac. Ab. Prerogative (E.) 5.

(*a*) 5 Rep. 14b.

(*b*) 13 Ed. I. ; Willion v. Berkeley, Plowd. 223 ; 11 Rep. 72a.

(*c*) 20 Hen. III. ; 2 Inst.

89.

(*d*) 2 Inst. 142.

(*e*) 2 Inst. 681.

(*f*) Co. Litt. 120a, note 3.

(*g*) 5 Rep. 14a ; 11 Rep. 66b ;

R. v. Abp. of Armagh, Stra. 516.

(*h*) See Bac. Ab. Prerog. (E.) 5.

(*i*) R. v. Wright, 1 A. & E. 434.

(*j*) De Bode v. R., 13 Q. B. 364.

(*k*) Per Cur., Id. 379.

CHAPTER VI.

SECTION I.—PRESUMPTION AGAINST INTENDING AN EXCESS OF JURISDICTION.

ANOTHER general presumption is that the Legislature does not intend to exceed its jurisdiction.

Primarily, the legislation of a country is territorial. The general rule is, that *extra territorium jus dicenti impune non paretur*; *leges extra territorium non obligant* (a). The laws of a nation apply to all its subjects and to all things and acts within its territories, including in this expression not only its ports and waters which form, in England, part of the adjacent county, but its ships, whether armed or unarmed, and the ships of its subjects on the high seas or in foreign tidal waters, and foreign private ships within its ports. They apply also to all foreigners within its territories (not privileged like sovereigns and ambassadors) as regards criminal (b), police, and, indeed,

(a) Dig. 2, 1, 20.

the purposes of extradition; R.

(b) So that an American committing a crime in Holland and flying to England is regarded as a Dutch subject for

v. Ganz, 9 Q. B. D. 93; and see *Atty.-Gen. v. Kwok Ah Sing*, L. R. 5 P. C. 179; *The Indian Chief*, 3 C. Rob. 12.

all other matters except some questions of personal status or capacity, in which, by the comity of nations, the law of their own country, or the *lex loci actûs* or *contractûs* applies (a). This does not, indeed, comprise the whole of the legitimate jurisdiction of a State; for it has a right to impose its legislation on its subjects, natural or naturalised (b), in every part of the world (c); and on such matters as personal status or capacity it is understood always to do so (d);

(a) See *Niboyet v. Niboyet*, 4 P. D. 1, *per* Brett L.J.; *San Theodoro v. San Theodoro*, 5 P. D. 79; Story, *Conf. L. s.* 100, *et seqq.* Comp. Worms *v. De Valdor*, 49 L. J. Ch. 261; *Le Sueur v. Le Sueur*, 1 P. D. 139; *Firebrace v. Firebrace*, 4 P. D. 63; *Re Goodman's Trusts*, 17 Ch. D. 266.

(b) *Co. Litt.* 129a; Story, *Conf. L. s.* 21; *Sussex Peerage*, 11 Cl. & F. 85, 146; *Mette v. Mette*, 1 Sw. & Tr. 416.

(c) Our law has at different times made treason, treason-felony, burning the Queen's ships and magazines, breaches of the Foreign Enlistment Act, homicide, bigamy, procuration (see 48 & 49 Vict. c. 69, s. 2), and slave-dealing, punishable when committed by British

subjects in any part of the world; also any offences committed by them on board any foreign ship to which they do not belong (30 & 31 Vict. c. 124); also, offences by them in native states in India (33 Geo. III. c. 52, s. 67), in Turkey, China, Siam, and Japan (6 & 7 Vict. c. 94, and 28 & 29 Vict. c. 116); and in some parts of Africa, Australia, and Polynesia 6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 57; 24 & 25 Vict. c. 31; 26 & 27 Vict. c. 35; 34 & 35 Vict. c. 8; 9 Geo. IV. c. 83; 35 & 36 Vict. c. 19).

(d) See *ex. gr. Brook v. Brook*, 27 L. J. Ch. 401, 9 H. L. 193; Story, *Conf. L. s.* 114; *Lolley's Case*, R. & R. 237. See also Story, *Conf. L. s.* 100 *et seqq.*; Wheat. *Elem. Internat. L.*, pt. 2, c. 2, ss. 6, 7.

but, with that exception, in the absence of an intention clearly expressed or to be inferred either from its language, or from the object or subject matter, or history of the enactment, the presumption is that Parliament does not design its statutes to operate on them, beyond the territorial limits of the United Kingdom (*a*). They are, therefore, to be read, usually, as if words to that effect had been inserted in them (*b*). Thus, a woman who married in England, and afterwards married abroad during her husband's life, was not indictable under the statute of James I. against bigamy; for the offence was committed out of the kingdom, and the Act did not in express terms extend its prohibition to subjects abroad (*c*). An act of bankruptcy by a British subject committed abroad, such as an assignment by a trader of all his effects, did not make him liable to the bankrupt laws until they were amended by extending them expressly to acts whether within the realm or elsewhere (*d*). A statute which authorised a Court to make an order against a British subject after he had been served

(*a*) *Rose v. Himely*, 4 Cranch, 241, *per* Marshall C.J.; *The Zollverein*, Swab. 96, *per* Dr. Lushington; *Cope v. Doherty*, 4 K. & J. 367.

(*b*) *Per* Pollock C.B. in *Rosseter v. Cahlmann*, 8 Ex. 361; and *per* Cur. in *The Amalia*, 1 Moo. N. S. 471.

(*c*) 1 Jac. I. c. 11; 1 Hale P. C. 692; *Macleod v. Atty.-Gen.* for N. S. Wales, [1891] A. C. 455.

(*d*) *Inglis v. Grant*, 5 T. R. 530; *Norden v. James*, 2 Dick. 533. See 6 Geo. IV. c. 16, s. 3; 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, s. 6, § 2.

with a summons, was held not to give jurisdiction to make it when the service had been effected abroad (*a*). But it has also been held that a provision that service may be effected by leaving the summons at the "last place of abode" of the person to be served, is not to be interpreted as meaning that the summons may be left at his last place of abode in England, where he had subsequently obtained a place of abode abroad (*b*). The 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 63, which prohibits the sale of liquids otherwise than by imperial measure, would not be considered as affecting a contract between British subjects for the sale of palm oil to be measured and delivered on the coast of Africa (*c*). A different construction would have involved the absurd supposition that the Legislature intended that English subjects should carry English measures abroad (*d*); besides setting aside, by a side-wind, the general principle that the validity of a contract is determined by the law of the place of its performance. Under that general principle, any statute which regulated the formalities and ceremonials of marriage, would, in general, be limited similarly in effect to the territorial jurisdiction of Parliament (*e*).

(*a*) 7 & 8 Vict. c. 101; *R. v. Lightfoot*, 6 F. & B. 822; (*c*) *Rosseter v. Cahlmann*, 8 Ex. 361.

Berkley v. Thompson, 10 App. Cas. 45. (*d*) *Per Parke B.*, Id.

(*e*) *Scrimshire v. Scrimshire*,

(*b*) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 65, s. 2 Hagg. Cons. 395; *Story*, Conf. 4; *R. v. Farmer*, [1892] 1 Q. L. s. 121.

B. 637.

But a different intention may be readily collected from the nature of the enactment. The whole aim and object of the Royal Marriage Act (12 Geo. III. c. 11), for instance, which was, according to the preamble, to guard against members of the royal family marrying without the consent of the sovereign, and which makes null and void the marriage of every descendant of George II. without the consent of the reigning sovereign, would have been defeated, if a marriage of such a descendant in some place out of the British dominions had not fallen within it. It was accordingly held that the statute imposed an incapacity, which attached to the person and followed him all over the world (*a*); though the marriage were valid according to the law of the country where it was celebrated (*b*). So, the 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 54, which declared "all marriages between persons within the "prohibited degrees" null and void, was held to create a personal incapacity in all British subjects domiciled in the United Kingdom, though married in a country where such marriages are valid (*c*). Where an Englishman, after marrying an Englishwoman in England, became domiciled in America, it was held that he continued subject to the English Divorce Act (*d*). The rule of the Education Act,

(*a*) The Sussex Peerage, 11 Ch. 401; 9 H. L. 193. See Story, Cl. & F. 85. Conf. L. s. 86, and also s. 100.

(*b*) Swift v. Kelly, 3 Knapp, 257. (*d*) Deck v. Deck, 29 L. J. P. M. & A. 129; see Bond v..

(*c*) Brook v. Brook, 27 L. J. Bond, Id. 143.

1870, which vacates the seat at the board of any member who has been punished with imprisonment for any crime, includes crimes committed against the Crown out of England (*a*).

This wider effect has been given even to a criminal statute, where such must have been manifestly its intention. The 5 Geo. IV. c. 113, which made it felony for "any persons" to deal in slaves, or to transport them, or equip vessels for their transport, was held to apply to British subjects committing any such offences on the coast of Africa, the notorious scene of the crimes which it was the object of the Act to suppress (*b*); if not in every other part of the world also (*c*); though it was not in express terms declared to be applicable abroad. As the Courts of British Colonies were empowered by Act of Parliament to punish certain offences committed at sea with, among other things, transportation, the Act which abolished transportation and substituted penal servitude, was held to extend to the Colonies, though it made no mention of them (*d*).

(*a*) 33 & 34 Vict. c. 75, another point, 29 L. J. C. P. Sched. II., Pt. I., r. 14; 348.

Conybeare v. London Sch. Bd., (*c*) See *per* Bramwell B., 29 [1891] 1 Q. B. 118. L. J. C. P. 352.

(*b*) R v. Zulueta, 1 Car. & (*d*) 12 & 13 Vict. c. 96; 20 K. 215; Santos v. Illidge, 28 & 21 Vict. c. 3; R. v. Mount, L. J. C. P. 317; overruled on L. R. 6 P. C. 283.

SECTION II.—PRESUMPTION AGAINST A VIOLATION OF
INTERNATIONAL LAW.

Under the same general presumption that the Legislature does not intend to exceed its jurisdiction, every statute is to be so interpreted and applied, as far as its language admits, as not to be inconsistent with the comity of nations, or with the established rules of international law (*a*). If, therefore, it designs to effectuate any such object, it must express its intention with irresistible clearness, to induce a Court to believe that it entertained it; for if any other construction is possible, it would be adopted, in order to avoid imputing such an intention to the Legislature (*b*). All general terms must be narrowed in construction to avoid it (*c*).

For instance, although foreigners are subject to the criminal law of the country in which they commit any breach of it, and also, for most purposes to its civil jurisdiction, a foreign sovereign, an ambassador, the troops of a foreign nation, and its public property are, by the law of nations, not subject to them (*d*), and

(*a*) *Per* Maule J. in *Leroux v. Fisher*, 2 Cranch, 390, and Brown, 12 C. B. 801; *Bluntschli*, *Murray v. Charming Betsy*, Id. Voelkerrecht, s. 847; *per* Dr. 118.

Lushington in *The Zollverein*, (*c*) *Per* Lord Stowell in *Le Swab*, 96, and *The Annapolis*, *Louis*, 2 Dods. 229.

Lush, 295.

(*d*) *Wheat. Elem. Int. L.*, pt.

(*b*) *Per* Cur. in *U. S. v. 2*, c. 2; and see the cases

statutes would be read as tacitly embodying this rule. Hence whilst the ambassador of a foreign State is in this country, and accredited to the sovereign, the Statute of Limitations does not begin to run against his creditors, as he could not be served with process during that period (*a*). So, it is an admitted principle of public law that, except as regards pirates *jure gentium*, and, perhaps, nomadic races and savages who have no political organisation (*b*), a nation has no jurisdiction over offences committed by a foreigner out of its territory, including its ships and waters as already mentioned (*c*); and the general language of any criminal statute would be so restricted in construction as not to violate this principle. Thus, the 9 Geo. IV. c. 31, s. 8 (re-enacted by the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 10), which enacted that when

collected in The Parlement civilised power, are made Belge, 5 P. D. 197; The cognisable by the Superior Constitution, 4 P. D. 39. Courts of the Settlements.

(*a*) 21 Jac. I. c. 16; 4 & 5 Anne, c. 16, s. 19; 7 Anne, c. 12, s. 3; *Musurus Bey v. Gadban*, [1894] 2 Q. B. 352. (*c*) Sup. 194. See Wheaton's Elem. Internat. L., pt. 2, c. 2, s. 9; The Parlement Belge, 5 P. D. 197; *R. v. Anderson*, L. R. 1 C. C. 161; *R. v. Seberg*, Id. 264; *R. v. Carr*, 10 Q. B. D. 76; *R. v. Lopes*, Dears. & B. 525; *R. v. Sattler*, Id.; *R. v. Lesley*, 1 Bell C. C. 220. See as to ships, the judgment of Lindley J. in *R. v. Keyn*, 2 Ex. D. 63.

(*b*) See *ex. gr. Ortolan*, *Dipl. de la Mer*, i. 285. By the 34 & 35 Vict. c. 8, offences committed within twenty miles from our West African Settlements on British subjects, or residents within those settlements by persons not the subjects of any

any person, feloniously injured abroad or at sea, died in England, or receiving the injury in England, died at sea or abroad, the offence should be dealt with in the country where the death or injury occurred, would not authorise the trial of a foreigner who inflicted a wound at sea in a foreign ship, of which the sufferer afterwards died in England (*a*). So, it has been repeatedly decided in America that an Act of Congress which enacted that any person committing robbery in "any vessel on the high seas" should be guilty of piracy, applied only to robbery in American vessels, and not to robbery in foreign vessels even by an American citizen (*b*). It was held that a foreigner, while navigating a foreign ship on a voyage to a foreign port, was not triable by the Courts of this country for a manslaughter committed on the voyage within three miles of the English Coast and in a British ship (*c*). An Act of Parliament which authorised the commanders of our ships of war to seize and prosecute "all ships and vessels" engaged in the

(*a*) *R. v. Lewis*, Dears. & B. 182; and see *R. v. Depardo*, 1 Taunt. 26; *R. v. De Mattos*, 7 C. & P. 458, *Nga Hoong v. R.*, 7 Cox, 489; *R. v. Bjornsen*, 34 L. J. M. C. 180. The 267th section of the Merc. Shipping Act of 1854, would seem for this reason limited to British subjects; and s. 527; *Harris*

v. Franconia, 2 C. P. D. 173.

(*b*) *U. S. v. Howard*, 3 Wash. 340; *U. S. v. Palmer*, 3 Wheat. 610; *U. S. v. Klintock*, 5 Wheat. 144; *U. S. v. Kessler*, Bald. 15, cited by Cockburn C.J. in *R. v. Keyn*, 2 Ex. D. 172.

(*c*) *R. v. Keyn*, 2 Ex. D. 63. So held by seven judges against six.

slave trade, was construed as not intended to affect any right or interest of foreigners contrary to the law of nations (a). Though speaking in just terms of indignation of the traffic in human beings, it spoke only in the name of the British nation. Its prohibition of the trade as contrary to the principles of justice, humanity, and sound policy, applied only to British subjects; it did not render it unlawful as regarded foreigners (b). It was even held that a foreigner who was not prohibited by the law of his own country from carrying it on, was entitled to recover in an English Court damages for the seizure of a cargo of his slaves by a British man-of-war; for, our Courts being open to all aliens in amity with us, and the act of the man-of-war being wrongful, the only question was what injury the plaintiff had sustained from it (c).

So, although a foreigner residing in England (d) who contracts debts, even abroad (e), and commits an act of bankruptcy in England, would be liable to the English bankrupt laws; he would not fall within them if he committed the act of bankruptcy abroad,

- (a) *Le Louis*, 2 Dods. 214; & Ald. 353. See also *Santos v. St. Juan Nepomuceno*, 1 Hagg. Illidge, 6 C. B. N. S. 841. 265; *The Antelope*, 10 Wheat. Comp. *Forbes v. Cochrane*, 2 B. 66; see also *R. v. Serva*, 1 Den. & C. 448.
104. Comp. *The Amedie*, 1 (d) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 52, s. 6, Acton, 240. sub. s. 1 (d); *Re Norris*, 5 M. B. R. 11.
(b) *Per Best J.*, 3 B. & Ald. 358.
(c) *Madrazo v. Willes*, 3 B. (e) *Exp. Pascal*, 1 Ch. D. 509.

although the enactment made it an act of bankruptcy, whether committed "within this realm or elsewhere" (a). The rules of Court, 1883, directing how writs were to be served on persons sued in the name of their firm, did not give jurisdiction over foreign firms (b). So an English Court would have no jurisdiction to wind up a foreign company having no branch in England (c). And s. 2 of the Naturalisation Act, 1870, which enacts that "real and personal property "of every description may be taken, acquired, held, and "disposed of by an alien in the same manner in all "respects as by a natural born British subject," has been held not to entitle a will to probate here which was made by an alien whose domicile of origin was English, but who was domiciled abroad at the time of making such will and of her death, the will having

(a) *Exp. Blain*, 12 Ch. D. 522; *Re Pearson*, [1892] 2 Q. B. 263; see also *Exp. Smith*, cited in *Alexander v. Vaughan*, 1 Cowp. 402; *Bulkeley v. Schutz*, L. R. 3 P. C. 764; *Bateman v. Service*, 6 A. C. 386; *Exp. O'Loughlen*, L. R. 6 Ch. 406; *Davis v. Park*, L. R. 8 Ch. 862n.; *Exp. Crispin*, L. R. 8 Ch. 374.

(b) *Order IX. r. 6*; *Western Nat. Bank v. Perez*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 304; *Russell v. Cambefort*, 23 Q. B. D. 526; *Dobson v.*

Festi, [1891] 2 Q. B. 92; *Grant v. Anderson & Co.*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 108. And see *Lysaght v. Clark & Co.*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 552; *Heinemann v. Halle*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 83; *St. Gobain Co. v. Hoyeremann's Agency*, [1892] 2 Q. B. 96; *Worcester Banking Co. v. Firbank & Co.*, [1894] 1 Q. B. 784.

(c) *Re Lloyd Italiano*, 29 Ch. D. 219; *Bulkeley v. Schutz*, L. R. 3 P. C. 764; and see *Colquhoun v. Heddon*, 25 Q. B. D. 129.

been executed according to the forms required by English law, but not in manner required by the law of the country of her domicile (*a*). And an Act which gave the Court of Admiralty jurisdiction over "all claims whatsoever" relating to salvage reward for saving lives has been held not to extend to the salvage of life on a foreign ship more than three marine miles from our shore (*b*).

So, as it is a rule of all systems of law that real property is exclusively subject to the laws of the State within whose territory it lies, any Act which dealt in general terms with the real estate of a bankrupt or lunatic or testator, for instance, would be construed as not extending to his lands abroad (*c*), or in our Colonies, unless it clearly appeared that the Act was intended to reach them (*d*). But a statute which imposed a stamp duty on all conveyances of land executed in England would obviously not be so limited in construction (*e*).

(*a*) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 114; *Re Blithman*, L. R. 2 Eq. 23; 33 Vict. c. 14; *Bloxam v. Favre*, Freke v. Carbery, 16 Eq. 461; 9 P. D. 130. *Waite v. Bingley*, 21 Ch. D.

(*b*) 17 & 18 Vict. c. 104, ss. 674; *Duncan v. Lawson*, 41 458, 476; *The Johannes*, Lush. Ch. D. 394; *Re Hawthorne*, 23 182. Ch. D. 743; *Story*, Conf. L.

(*c*) *Selkraig v. Davies*, 2 Rose, ss. 428, 551, etc. 311; *Cockerell v. Dickens*, 3 (*d*) See *Re Hewitt's Estate*, 6 W. R. 537. Comp. *Re Internat. Pulp, etc., Co.*, 3 Ch. D. 594. Moo. P. C. 133. See also *Sill v. Worswick*, 1 H. Bl. 665; *Phillips v. Hunter*, 2 Id. 402; *Hunter v. Potts*, 4 T. R. 182; (*e*) *Re Wright*, 11 Ex. 458.

It being also a general principle that personal property has, except for some purposes, such as probate (*a*), no other situs than that of its owner, the right and disposition of it are governed by the law of the domicile of the owner, and not by the law of their local situation (*b*). The Bankrupt Acts, therefore, which effect an assignment of a bankrupt's personal property, would properly be construed as applying to such property everywhere (*c*).

When an Act imposes a burden in respect of personal property, it would be construed, as far as its language permitted, as not intended to contravene the general principle (*d*). Thus, the 36 Geo. III. c. 52, which imposed a duty on "every legacy given by any "will of any person out of his personal estate," and the Succession Duty Act, 16 & 17 Vict. c. 51, which imposed a duty on every "disposition of property" by which "any person" became "entitled to any "property on the death of another," was held not to apply where the deceased was a foreigner, or even a British subject domiciled abroad, though the property was in England (*e*). But they would affect personal

(*a*) And see *Hart v. Herwig*,
L. R. 8 Ch. 860.

(*b*) *Story, Conf. L. s. 376*.
See ex. gr. *Re Elliott*, 39 W.
R. 297.

(*c*) See the cases cited sup.
205, note (*c*). *Re Atkinson*, 21
Ch. D. 100.

(*d*) See ex. gr. *Grenfell v.*
Inland Rev. Com., 1 Ex. D.
242.

(*e*) In *Re Bruce*, 2 Cr. & J.
436; *Arnold v. Arnold*, 2 Myl. &
Cr. 256; *Thomson v. The Adv.-*
Gen., 12 Cl. & F. 1; *Wallace v.*
The Atty.-Gen., L. R. 1 Ch. 1;

property abroad, if the deceased was domiciled in England, though a foreigner (*a*). Foreigners residing abroad but carrying on business in England by agents obtaining orders in England, are liable to income tax on profits so made (*b*), Schedule D of 16 & 17 Vict. c. 34, imposing liability to assessment on persons resident abroad, but deriving profit from trade carried on in this country. The Interpleader Act does not empower our Courts to bar the claim of a foreigner residing abroad (*c*).

It is hardly necessary to add, however, that if the language of an Act of Parliament, unambiguously and without reasonably admitting of any other meaning, applies to foreigners abroad, or is otherwise in conflict with any principle of international law, the Courts must obey and administer it as it stands, whatever

- Hamilton *v.* Dallas, 1 Ch. D. 257. See also Udney *v.* East India Co., 13 C. B. 733; Erichsen *v.* Last, 8 Q. B. D. 414; Cesena Sulphur Co. *v.* Nicholson, 1 Ex. D. 428; Calcutta Jute Co. *v.* Nicholson, Id.; Sulley *v.* Atty.-Gen., 5 H. & N. 71; *Re* Atkinson, 21 Ch. D. 100. Comp. The Atty.-Gen. *v.* Campbell, L. R. 5 H. L. 524; *Re* Cigala's Settlement, 7 Ch. D. 351; Colquhoun *v.* Brooks, 14 App. Cas. 493. Comp. London Bank of Mexico *v.* Aphorpe, [1891] 2 Q. B. 378.
- (*a*) Atty.-Gen. *v.* Napier, 6 Ex. 217.
- (*b*) Pommery *v.* Aphorpe, 56 L. J. Q. B. 155; Werle *v.* Colquhoun, 20 Q. B. D. 753; Grainger *v.* Gough, [1895] 1 Q. B. 71.
- (*c*) Patorni *v.* Campbell, 12 M. & W. 277; Lindsey *v.* Barron, 6 C. B. 291. But see Credits Gereundeuse *v.* Van Weede, 12 Q. B. D. 179.

may be the responsibility incurred by the nation to foreign powers in executing such a law (*a*); for the Courts cannot question the authority of Parliament, or assign any limits to its power (*b*). They could not, therefore, properly put a construction upon a statute different from that which they would otherwise give to it, merely because its language would otherwise fail to give to a foreigner the full advantage of the provisions of a treaty (*c*).

The 4th section of the Statute of Frauds, which enacts that "no action shall be brought" in respect, among others, of contracts not to be performed within a year, unless they be in writing, was construed literally as regulating the procedure of our Courts, and, therefore, as prohibiting a suit on a contract made in France and in accordance with French law, but not in conformity with the formalities required by our law (*d*). But this construction has been questioned (*e*); and having regard to the principle

(*a*) *Per Cur.* in *The Marianna* Rep. 118a; *Day v. Savadge*, Hob. Flora, 11 Wheat. 40; *The* 87; *London v. Wood*, 12 Mod. Zollverein, Swab. 96; *The Jo-* 688; 1 Kent Comm. 447.

hannes, Lush. 182; *The Amalia*, (c) *Re Californian Fig Syrup* 32 L. J. P. M. & A. 191. As Co., 40 Ch. D. 620.

to the Hovering Acts (39 & 40 (d) *Leroux v. Brown*, 12 C. Vict. c. 36, s. 179, embodying the B. 801; recognised by Lush J. 16 & 17 Vict. c. 107, s. 212), see and Mellor J. in *Jones v. Le Louis*, 2 Dode. 245; *Church* Victoria Graving Dock, 2 Q. B. v. *Hubbart*, 2 Cranch, 187. See D. 323.

also 2 & 3 Vict. c. 73. (e) See *Williams v. Wheeler*,

(b) *Comp. Bonham's Case*, 8 8 C. B. N. S. 299; *Gibson v*

under consideration, the enactment might reasonably have been confined to those contracts which it was within the province of Parliament to regulate.

SECTION III.—HOW FAR STATUTES CONFERRING RIGHTS
AFFECT FOREIGNERS.

It may be added, in connection with this topic, that as regards the question how far statutes which confer rights or privileges are to be construed as extending to foreigners abroad, the authorities are less clear. It has been said, indeed, that when personal rights are conferred, and persons filling any character of which foreigners are capable are mentioned, foreigners would be comprehended in the statute (*a*). On the other hand, it has been laid down that, in general, statutes must be understood as applying to those only who owe obedience to the Legislature which enacts them, and whose interests it is the duty of that Legislature to protect; that is, its own subjects, including in that expression, not only natural born and naturalised subjects, but also all persons actually within its territorial jurisdiction; but that as regards aliens resident abroad, the Legislature has no concern

Holland, L. R. 1 C. P. 8, *per* observing on *Acebal v. Levy*, 10
Willes J.; and the notes to Bing. 376.
Birkmyr v. Darnell, and *Mostyn* (*a*) *Per* Maule J. in *Jefferys*
v. Fabrigas, 1 Sm. L. C. See *v. Boosey*, 4 H. L. 895.
also *Story*, Conf. L. s. 285n.,

to protect their interests, any more than it has a legitimate power to control their rights (*a*). In this view, it would be presumed, in interpreting a statute, that the Legislature did not intend to legislate either as to their rights or liabilities; and to warrant a different conclusion, the words of the statute ought to be express, or the context of it very clear (*b*). On this principle, mainly, it was held that the Act of Anne, which gave a copyright of fourteen years to "the author of any work," did not apply to a foreign author resident abroad (*c*). The decision would probably have been different if the author had been in England when his work was published (*d*). The later Act, 5 & 6 Vict. c. 45, which does not appear to differ materially, as regards this question, from that of Anne, was held to protect a foreign author who was in the British dominions at the time of publication (*e*). It was held also that a foreigner was entitled to maintenance, and to gain a settlement, under the poor laws (*f*). And it was decided in the Court of

- (*a*) See *per* Jervis C.J. in *v. Doherty*, 27 L. J. Ch. 609.
Jefferys v. Boosey, 4 H. L. 946; (*c*) 8 Anne, c. 19; *Jefferys*
per Lord Cranworth, Id. 955; *v. Boosey*, 4 H. L. 815;
per Wood V.C. in *Cope v. dubitante Lord Cairns in Rout-*
Doherty, 4 K. & J. 367; *per ledge v. Low*, L. R. 3 H. L. 100.
Lord Esher M.R. in Colquhoun (d) Per Lord Cranworth, in
v. Heddon, 25 Q. B. D. 129. *Jefferys v. Boosey, ubi sup.*
Comp. per Lord Westbury in (e) Routledge v. Low, L. R.
Routledge v. Low, L. R. 3 H. 3 H. L. 100.
L. 100. (*f*) *R. v. Eastbourne*, 4 East,
(*b*) *Per Turner L.J. in Cope* 103.

Admiralty that the 9 & 10 Vict. c. 93, which gives a right of action to the personal representative of a person killed by a wrongful and actionable act or neglect, extended to the representative of a foreigner who had been killed on the high seas, in a foreign ship, in a collision with an English vessel (a). But it has since been decided that that Court has no jurisdiction whatever under that Act (b).

On the other hand, it has been held that the 7 & 8 Vict. c. 101, which empowered the mother of a natural child to sue its putative father for its maintenance, did not extend to a foreign woman who had become pregnant in England, but had given birth to the child abroad (c). The history, as well as the language of the enactment, showed that the liability arose from the birth of the child in this country (d). In the converse case of conception abroad and birth in England, the law would extend to the mother (e). The benefit of those enactments which, prior to the Merchant Shipping Act of 1862, limited the liability of shipowners for damage done, without their own fault, by their servants, to other ships, was held not to extend to foreign vessels ; one reason being that the object of the Legislature, in giving such a privilege, was to encourage the national shipping only, by removing the

(a) *The Guldfaxe*, L. R. 2 Ad. & Ec. 325; *The Explorer*, L. R. 3 Ad. & Ec. 289. (c) *R. v. Blane*, 13 Q. B. 769. (d) *Per Coleridge J.*, Id. 773. (e) *Hampton v. Rickard*, 43

(b) *Seward v. The Vera Cruz*, L. J. M. C. 133.
10 App. Cas. 59.

terrors of a liability commensurate with the damage done (*a*). But they were held to protect a British ship in a suit by a foreign ship, whether the collision took place in British waters (*b*) or on the high seas (*c*).

In the latter case, the protecting enactment applied in express terms to foreign as well as British ship-owners ; and though it would probably have been read as if the words " within British jurisdiction " had been inserted (*d*), if the Act had been considered as exceeding the legislative powers of Parliament to control the natural rights of foreigners, there was no such encroachment in fact, in its full operation. For the nature and measure of legal remedies are governed by the *lex fori* ; and it is no breach of international law, or any interference with the rights of foreigners, to determine what redress is to be given to suitors who resort to our Courts (*e*). A foreigner, for instance, was liable to arrest in this country for a debt contracted abroad, though it would have exposed him to no such peril there ; and he would be barred in our

(*a*) *The Carl Johann*, 1 Hagg. 113 ; *Cope v. Doherty*, 4 K. & J. 367. *The Wild Ranger*, 32 L. J. Ad. 49. See *The Saxonia*, Lush. 410.

(*b*) *The General Iron Screw Co. v. Schurmanns*, 1 Jo. & H. 180.

(*c*) *The Amalia*, 1 Moo. N. S. 471.

(*d*) See *The Dumfries*, Swab. 63.

(*e*) *The Amalia*, ubi sup. ; *The Vernon*, 1 W. Rob. 316 ; *Bank of U. S. v. Donnally*, 8 Peters, 361. See *Jackson v. Spittall*, L. R. 5 C. P. 542 ; *Re Haney's Trusts*, L. R. 10 Ch. 275 ; *Chartered Merc. Bk. v. Netherlands Steam Navig. Co.*, 10 Q. B. D. 521 ; *Jacobs v. Crédit Lyonnais*, 12 Q. B. D. 589.

Courts by our Statute of Limitations, though he was not by the prescription of his own country (*a*). The provisions of the Admiralty Court Act of 1861, which give (by ss. 4 and 5) to the Court of Admiralty jurisdiction over any claims for the building of any ship, and also for necessities supplied to any ship elsewhere than in the port to which she belongs, unless the owner be domiciled in England, were held to be confined to British ships, on the ground of the improbability that the British Parliament had intended to legislate for foreigners in foreign ports (*b*). But the seamen of a ship of any nation are entitled to sue for wages in the Admiralty Court, under the 10th section of the same Act, which gives that Court jurisdiction over any claim by a seaman of any ship for wages (*c*). It has been held that as the English sailing rules are not binding on foreign ships on the high seas, a foreign ship was precluded, in a collision suit, from imputing to the British ship with which the collision occurred, a breach of any of those rules; on the ground that it had no right to benefit by rules by which it was not, itself, bound (*d*).

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>De la Vega v. Vianna</i>, 1 B. & Ad. 284; <i>Don v. Lippmann</i>, 5 Cl. & F. 1; <i>Gen. Steam Navig. Co. v. Guillou</i>, 11 M. & W. 877; <i>Lopez v. Burslem</i>, 4 Moo. P. C. 300; <i>British Linen Co. v. Drummond</i>, 10 B. & C. 903; <i>Huber v. Steiner</i>, 2 Bing. N. C. 202; <i>Finch v. Finch</i>, 45</p> | <p>L. J. Ch. 816; <i>Alliance Bank v. Cary</i>, 5 C. P. D. 429; <i>Re Reuss Kostritz</i>, 49 L. J. P. & M. 67; <i>The Leon</i>, 6 P. D. 148.</p> <p>(<i>b</i>) <i>The India</i>, 32 L. J. P. M. & A. 185.</p> <p>(<i>c</i>) <i>The Nina</i>, L. R. 2 P. C. 38.</p> <p>(<i>d</i>) <i>The Zollverein</i>, Swab. 96.</p> |
|--|---|

CHAPTER VII.

SECTION I.—REPUGNANCY—REPEAL BY IMPLICATION— ACTS IN, OR INVOLVING, THE NEGATIVE.

AN author must be supposed to be consistent with himself; and, therefore, if in one place he has expressed his mind clearly, it ought to be presumed that he is still of the same mind in another place, unless it clearly appears that he has changed it (*a*). In this respect, the work of the Legislature is treated in the same manner as that of any other author; and the language of every enactment must be so construed, as far as possible, as to be consistent with every other which it does not in express terms modify or repeal (*b*). The law, therefore, will not allow the revocation or alteration of a statute by construction when the words may have their proper operation without it (*c*). But it is impossible to will contradictions; and if the provisions of a later Act are so inconsistent with, or repugnant to those of an earlier Act that the two

(*a*) Puff. L. N. b. 5, c. 12, Lyn. v. Wyn, Bridg. Rep. by s. 9. Bannister, 122. Per A. L.

(*b*) See ante, p. 46. Smith J. in Kutner v. Phillips,

(*c*) Per Bridgman C.J. in [1891] 2 Q. B. 267.

cannot stand together (*a*), the earlier stands impliedly repealed by the later (*b*). *Leges posteriores priores contrarias abrogant. Ubi duæ contrariæ leges sunt, semper antiquæ obrogat nova* (*c*).

A difference, indeed, has been said to exist in this respect between the effect of a saving clause or exception and a proviso in a statute. When the proviso appended to the enacting part is repugnant to it, it unquestionably repeals the enacting part (*d*); but it is said by Lord Coke that when the enactment and the saving clause (which reserves something which would be otherwise included in the words of the enacting part (*e*)) are repugnant—as where a statute vests a manor in the King, saving the rights of all persons, or vests in him the manor of A. saving the rights of A.—the saving clause is to be rejected, because otherwise the enactment would have been made in vain (*f*). One authority which he cites for this proposition is the case of the reversal of the Duke of Norfolk's attainder, by an Act of Mary. That Act declared that the earlier statute of 38 Hen.

(*a*) *West Ham v. Fourth City Co.*, 9 Q. B. D. 753, *per* Field J. Building Society, [1892] 1 Q. B. 654. (*c*) *Livy*, b. 9, c. 34.

(*b*) *Co. Litt.* 112; *Shep. Waterworks*, Fitzg. 195. Touchst. 88; *Grot. b. 2, c. 16*, (*e*) *Co. Litt.* 47a; *Shep. Touchst.* 78.

s. 4; *Sims v. Doughty*, 5 Ves. 243; *Constantine v. Constantine*, 6 Ves. 100; *Morral v. Sutton*, 1 Phil. 533; *Brown v. G. W. R. Simmons*, 10 Ch. D. 518. (*f*) *Alton Wood's Case*, 1 Rep. 47. See *Yarmouth v. Simmons*, 10 Ch. D. 518.

VIII., which had attainted the Duke, was no Act, but utterly void, providing, however, that this reversal should not take from the grantees of Henry VIII. or Edward VI. any lands of the Duke which those Kings had granted to them; and this provision was held inoperative to save the rights of the grantees. But this resulted, it is said, not because the saving clause was repugnant to the enacting part, but because the latter, in declaring the attainder void, in effect established also that the lands of the Duke had never vested in the Crown; that none, consequently, had ever passed to the grantees; and that there was thus no interest to be saved on which the clause could operate (*a*).

The illustrations given by Coke are cases of conveyance of land; and the rule as regards the construction of repugnant passages in a conveyance by deed has always been that the earlier of them prevails (*b*). But it may be questioned whether there is any solid ground for this distinction between a saving clause and a proviso in a statute. The later of two passages in a statute, being the expression of the later intention, should prevail over the earlier; as it unquestionably would, if it were embodied in a separate Act.

It has been held that where a statute merely

(*a*) *Walshingham's Case*,
Plowd. 565; see *Savings In-*
stitution v. Makin, 23 Maine,
370.

(*b*) *Co. Litt.* 112; *Shep.*
Touchst. 81; *Cother v. Merrick*,
Hard. 94; *Furnivall v. Coombes*,
5 M. & Gr. 736.

re-enacts the provision of an earlier one, it is to be read as part of the earlier statute, and not of the re-enacting one, if it is in conflict with another passed after the first, but before the last Act; and therefore does not repeal by implication the intermediate one (*a*). Where a passage in a schedule appended to a statute was repugnant to one in the body of the statute, the latter was held to prevail (*b*).

When the later of the two general enactments is couched in negative terms, it is difficult to avoid the inference that the earlier one is impliedly repealed by it. For instance, if a general Act exempts from licensing regulations the sale of a certain kind of beer, and a subsequent one enacts that "no beer" shall be sold without a license, it would obviously be impossible to save the former from the repeal implied in the latter (*c*). The Highway Act which enacted that "no action" for anything done under it should be begun after three months from the cause of action, was so clearly inconsistent, as regards actions against justices,

(*a*) *Morisse v. Royal British Bank*, 1 C. B. N. S. 87, *per Willes J.* citing *Wallace v. Blackwell*, 3 Drew. 538; and see *R. v. Dove*, 3 B. & Ald. 596.

(*b*) *R. v. Baines*, 12 A. & E. 227; *Allen v. Flicker*, 10 A. & E. 640, *per Patteson J.*; *R. v. Russell*, 13 Q. B. 237; *Dean*

Green, 8 P. D. 79. See *Clarke v. Gaut*, 8 Ex. 252. As to Statutory Rules see *Institute of Patent Agents v. Lockwood*, [1894] A. C. 360, ante, p. 72.

(*c*) *Read v. Storey*, 30 L. J. M. C. 110; remedied by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 21, s. 3.

with the 24 Geo. II., which limited the time to six months, that it necessarily repealed the later (*a*).

But even when the later statute is in the affirmative, it is often found to involve that negative which makes it fatal to the earlier enactment (*b*). The 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 74, which empowered a married woman to dispose by deed of land which she held in fee, provided she did so with the concurrence of her husband, was impliedly repealed by the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, which enables her in general terms to dispose of all real property as if she were a feme sole (*c*). If an Act requires that a juror shall have twenty pounds a year, and a new one enacts that he shall have twenty marks, the latter necessarily implies, on pain of being itself inoperative, that the earlier qualification shall not be necessary, and thus repeals the first Act (*d*). An Act empowering a railway company to erect a station on any scheduled lands within the limits of deviation would override the provisions of the earlier Metropolis Management Amendment Act, 1862, s. 75, which forbade the erection of buildings beyond the general line of buildings in a street (*e*). The

- | | |
|--|---|
| (a) 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 50, s. 109, 24 Geo. II. c. 44, s. 8; <i>Rix v. Borton</i> , 12 A. & E. 470. | (c) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 75; <i>Re Drummond</i> , [1891] 1 Ch. 524. |
| (b) <i>Bac. Ab. Stat. (D.)</i> ; | (d) <i>Jenk. 2nd Cent. Case 73</i> ; |
| <i>Foster's Case</i> , 5 Rep. 59. See Lord Blackburn's judgment in <i>Garnett v. Bradley</i> , 3 App. 966. | 1 Bl. Comm. 89. |
| | (e) 25 & 26 Vict. c. 102, s. 75; <i>City & South London Ry. v. London C.C.</i> , [1891] 2 Q. B. |

53 Geo. III. c. 127, giving power to two justices to enforce the payment of a church rate, when its validity was undisputed and the sum due was under ten pounds, provided that where the validity was disputed, the justices should forbear from adjudicating, and provided that nothing in the Act should alter or affect the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts to decide cases touching the validity of the rate, or where the sum exceeded ten pounds, was held to repeal the jurisdiction of the latter Courts, where it was given to the justices, the provisoes showed that an alteration in the jurisdiction was intended (*a*). The 5 & 6 Vict. c. 22, s. 16, which authorised the Secretary of State to remove to Bethlehem Hospital any prisoner confined in the Queen's prison who was of unsound mind, was held, as regards such prisoners, to repeal impliedly the earlier enactment of 1 & 2 Vict. c. 110, s. 102, which provided that a prisoner for debt of unsound mind should be discharged after certain inquiries and formalities (*b*). Where an Act of Charles II. enabled two justices of the peace, "whereof one to be of the quorum," to remove any person likely to be chargeable to the parish in which he comes to inhabit; and another, after reciting this provision, repealed it, and enacted that no person

513; *London C.C. v. London* 4 A. & E. 442.

Sch. Bd., [1892] 2 Q. B. 606.

(*b*) *Gore v. Grey*, 13 C. B.

(*a*) *Rickards v. Dyke*, 3 Q. N. S. 138.

B. 256; *Ricketts v. Bodenham*,

should be removable until he became chargeable, in which case "two justices of the peace" were empowered to remove him; it was held that the later Act dispensed with the qualification of being of the quorum (*a*).

The provision of the 43 Eliz. which gave an appeal without any limits as to time against overseers' accounts, was impliedly repealed by a subsequent Act, which gave power to appeal to the next Quarter Sessions (*b*).

The Nuisances Removal Act of 1848, in providing that the costs of obtaining and executing an order of justices under the Act against an owner of premises should be recoverable in the County Court, impliedly repealed, as regards such cases, the enactment of the County Court Act, that those Courts should not take cognizance of cases where title to real property was in question; for it would have been inoperative if the Court could not decide the question of ownership (*c*). So, where justices were empowered to punish summarily acts of malicious damage to property, except when done "under a fair and reasonable supposition" of a right, it was held that this proviso impliedly repealed, *pro tanto*, the general principle which ousts

(*a*) 13 & 14 Car. II. c. 12, Geo. II. c. 38, s. 4; *R. v. Worcester* and 35 Geo. III. c. 101; *R. v. Llangian*, 4 B. & S. 249, dissentiente Cockburn C.J. (*c*) 11 & 12 Vict. c. 123, s. 3, and 9 & 10 Vict. c. 95, s. 58;

(*b*) 43 Eliz. c. 2, s. 6, and 17 *R. v. Harden*, 2 E. & B. 188.

the jurisdiction of justices when a *bonâ fide* claim of right is asserted ; and that the justices were not bound to abstain from adjudicating until satisfied that the act had been done under a fair and reasonable supposition of right (*a*). So, where one Act empowered justices to enforce the payment of costs given by the Queen's Bench on appeal against convictions, except where the party liable was under recognizances to pay such costs ; and a later one authorised the Quarter Sessions to give costs in "any appeal," to be recovered in the manner provided by the first Act ; it was held that the exception in that Act was impliedly repealed, and that a distress warrant had been properly issued against the party liable, though he was under recognizances (*b*). The Judicature Act of 1873 repealing in general words all statutes inconsistent with it, and enacting that the costs of all proceedings in the High Court shall be in the discretion of the Court, and that where an action is tried by a jury, the costs shall follow the event unless the Judge, at the trial, or the Court otherwise orders, was held to repeal the Act of James I. which deprived a successful plaintiff of costs in an action of slander when he did not recover as much as forty shillings damages (*c*). An enactment

(*a*) *White v. Feast*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 353.

(*b*) 11 & 12 Vict. c. 43, s. 27, 12 & 13 Vict. c. 45, s. 5 ; *Freeman v. Read*, 9 C. B. N. S. 301.

(*c*) *Garnett v. Bradley*, 3 App. 944 ; *Rockett v. Clippingdale*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 293. See also *per* Jessel M.R. in *Mersey Docks v. Lucas*, 51 L. J. Q. B. 116 ;

that the *custos rotulorum* shall nominate a fit person to be clerk of the peace *quamdiu bene se gesserit*, impliedly repealed an earlier one which authorised the appointment *durante bene placito*; for a grant under the former would be inconsistent with one under the latter of the above Acts (*a*). Where an Act made it actionable to sell a pirated copy of a work with knowledge that it was pirated, and a subsequent Act contained a similar provision, but without any mention of guilty knowledge, it was held that the earlier Act was so far abrogated that an action was maintainable for a sale made in ignorance of the piracy (*b*). Where one Act imposed a penalty of 5s. for killing or selling a wild bird between March and August, unless it was proved that the bird had been brought from abroad before March; and a later one, after reciting that this enactment was insufficient for the protection of wild birds during the breeding season, imposed a penalty of 20s. for killing or "possessing" a wild bird between February and July, it was held that the later Act impliedly repealed the proviso of the earlier Act, which admitted the excuse that the bird had been imported (*c*). Where an Act required that a consent

Gardner v. Whitford, 4 C. B. N. S. 665.

(*a*) *Owen v. Saunders*, 1 Lord Raym. 158. See another illustration in *Re North Wales Gunpowder Co.*, [1892] 2 Q. B. 220.

(*b*) *West v. Francis*, 5 B. & Ald. 737; *Gambart v. Sumner*,

5 H. & N. 5.

(*c*) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 78, and 39 & 40 Vict. c. 29; *Whitehead v. Smithers*, 2 C. P. D. 553. See 43 & 44 Vict. c. 35,

should be given in writing attested by two witnesses, and a subsequent Act made the consent valid if in writing, but made no mention of witnesses, this silence was held to repeal by implication the provision which required them (a). The 1 Eliz. c. 1, which empowers the Queen to authorise ecclesiastical persons to administer ex officio oaths to supposed offenders, was impliedly repealed by the 16 Car. I., which took away the oaths (b). Where an Act exempted from impressment all seamen employed in the Greenland fisheries, and a later one exempted seamen embarked for those fisheries whose names were registered and who gave security, it was held that the earlier was repealed pro tanto by the later Act (c).

A curious complication of legislation involving a repeal by implication is afforded by the Judicature Act, 1873, and the County Courts Acts of 1875 and 1888. Under the Judicature Act, 1873, s. 45, which came into operation in 1875, it was enacted that from a decision of a Divisional Court on appeal from a County Court there should be no further appeal without the leave of the Divisional Court. But the and 44 & 45 Vict. c. 51; in *Kyle v. Jeffreys*, 3 Macq. Taylor v. Rogers, 50 L. J. M. 611. See *Hodgson v. Bell*, 24 C. 132. Q. B. D. 525.

(a) *Cumberland v. Copeland*, 1 H. & C. 194; *per Jervis C.J.* 185.
(b) *Birch v. Lake*, 1 Mod. 185.
(c) *Exp. Caruthers*, 9 East, 943; and *per Lord Wensleydale* 44.

County Court Act, 1875, which came into operation the following day, enacted that there should be an appeal without leave from the Divisional Court, if the latter "altered" the judgment of the County Court in an Admiralty cause, and consequently pro tanto repealed s. 45 of the Judicature Act. The County Court Act, 1888, repealed the provision of the County Court Act, 1875, referred to, but provided that the repeal should not revive any enactment not in force when it was passed. This express repeal consequently did not revive s. 45 of the Judicature Act, 1873, so far as it was impliedly repealed by the County Court Act, 1875 (*a*).

Where a statute contemplates in express terms that its enactments will repeal earlier Acts, by their inconsistency with them, the chief argument or objection against repeal by implication is removed, and the earlier Acts may be more readily treated as repealed. Thus, after a local Act had directed the trustees of a turnpike to keep their accounts and proceedings in books to which "all persons" should have access, the General Turnpike Act, which recited the great importance of one uniform system being adhered to in the laws regulating turnpikes, and enacted that former laws should continue in force, except as they were thereby varied or repealed, directed that the trustees should keep their accounts in a book to be

(*a*) 36 & 37 Vict. c. 66, 38 Vict. c. 43, s. 188; *The Dart*, & 39 Vict. c. 50, s. 10, 51 & 52 [1893] 1 Q. B. 33.

open to the inspection of the trustees and creditors of the tolls, and that the book of their proceedings should be open to the inspection of the trustees; it was held that the power of inspection of the proceedings given by the first Act to "all persons" was repealed (a).

Again, if the co-existence of two sets of provisions would be destructive of the object for which the later was passed, the earlier would be repealed by the later. Thus, when a local Act empowered one body to name the streets and to number the houses in a town, and another local Act gave the same power to another body, the earlier would be superseded by the later Act; for, to leave the power with both, would be to defeat the object of the Legislature (b). But if one Act imposed a toll, payable to turnpike trustees, for passing along a road, and another transferred the duty of repairing the road to another body, prohibiting also the trustees from repairing it, the toll would not be thereby impliedly repealed (c).

A later Act which conferred a new right, would repeal an earlier one, if the co-existence of the right which it gave would be productive of inconve-

(a) *R. v. Northleach*, 5 B. & Ad. 978.

(b) *Daw v. Metropolitan Board*, 31 L. J. C. P. 223. See *Cortis v. Kent Waterworks*, 7 B. & C. 314; *R. v. Middlesex*, 2 B. & Ad. 818; *Bates v. Winstanley*, 4 M. & S. 429.

(c) *Phipson v. Harvett*, 1 Cr. M. & R. 473. *Comp. Brown v. G. W. R. Co.*, 51 L. J. Q. B. 529. See also *Tabernacle Bldg. Soc. v. Knight*, [1892] A. C. 298; *Re Kirkleatham Local Board*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 375.

nience; for the just inference from such a result would be that the Legislature intended to take the earlier right away (*a*). Thus, the Joint Stock Banking Act of 7 Geo. IV. c. 46, which besides limiting and varying the common law liabilities of members of banking companies, provided that suits against such companies should and lawfully might be instituted against the public officer, was held to take away by implication the common law right of suing the individual members (*b*), for from the nature of the case, this must have been what the Legislature intended (*c*).

In other circumstances, also, the inconvenience or incongruity of keeping two enactments in force has justified the conclusion that one impliedly repealed the other, for the Legislature is presumed not to intend such consequences. Thus, the 9 Geo. IV. c. 61, which prohibited keeping open public-houses during the hours of afternoon divine service, was held repealed by implication *pro tanto* by the 18 & 19 Vict. c. 118, which prohibited the sale between three and five o'clock p.m., the usual hours of afternoon divine service. If both Acts had co-existed, it would

(*a*) See *inf.*, Chap. VIII, Sec. I. See also *Green v. R.*, 1 App. Cas. 513; *Roles v. Rosewell*, and

(*b*) *Steward v. Greaves*, 10 M. & W. 711; *Chapman v. Hardy v. Bern*, 5 T. R. 538.

(*c*) *Per* Lord Cranworth in *O'Flaherty v. McDowell*, 6 H. L. 157. See *Cowley v. Byas*, 5 Ch. D. 944.

have been in the power of the clergyman of every parish to close the public-houses for four hours instead of two, by beginning the afternoon service at one or at five p.m., an intention too singular to be lightly attributed to the Legislature (a).

An intention to repeal an Act may be gathered from its repugnancy to the general course of subsequent legislation. Thus the 7 Geo. I. c. 21, which prohibited bottomry loans by Englishmen to foreigners on foreign ships engaged in the Indian trade, was held to have been silently repealed by the subsequent enactments which put an end to the monopoly of the East India Company, and threw its trade open to foreign as well as to all British ships (b).

SECTION II.—CONSISTENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTS.

But repeal by implication is not favoured (c). A sufficient Act ought not to be held to be repealed by

(a) *R. v. Whiteley*, 3 H. & N. 143; *Whiteley v. Heaton*, 27 L. J. M. C. 217, S. C. See *Harris v. Jenns*, 9 C. B. N. S. 152; *R. v. Senior*, L. & C. 401; *R. v. Bucks*, 2 E. & B. 447; *R. v. Knapp*, 22 L. J. M. C. 139, S. C. See another example of a similar kind, in *Manchester (Mayor) v. Lyons*, 22 Ch. D. 277. See also *R. v. Northleach*, 5 B. & Ad. 978; *West Ham v. Fourth City Building Soc.*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 654. Comp. *per Ex. Ch. in Shrewsbury v. Scott*, 6 C. B. N. S. 1. See other illustrations in *Re Yearwood's Trusts*, 5 Ch. D. 545; *R. v. Inland Revenue*, 21 Q. B. D. 569; *R. v. West Riding*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 722.

(b) *The India, Br. & L.* 221.

(c) *Foster's Case*, 11 Rep. 63a.

implication without some strong reason (*a*). It is a reasonable presumption that the Legislature did not intend to keep really contradictory enactments in the statute-book, or to effect so important a measure as the repeal of a law without expressing an intention to do so. Such an interpretation, therefore, is not to be adopted, unless it be inevitable. Any reasonable construction which offers an escape from it is more likely to be in consonance with the real intention.

It is sometimes found that the conflict of two statutes is apparent only, as their objects are different, and the language of each is therefore restricted, as pointed out in the preceding chapter, to its own object or subject. When their language is so confined, they run in parallel lines, without meeting. Thus the real property statute of limitations, 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 27, which limits the time for suing for the recovery of land (which is defined to include tithes) to twenty years after the right accrued, was found not to affect the provision of the Act of the preceding session, 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 100, which enacts that claims to exemption from tithes shall be valid after non-payment for thirty years; for the former Act dealt with conflicting claims to the right of receiving tithes which are admittedly payable; while the latter related to the liability to pay them (*b*).

(*a*) *Per* Lord Bramwell in *G. W.R. v. Swindon & Cheltenham Ry.*, 9 App. Cas. at p. 809. (*b*) *Ely (Dean of) v. Cash*, 15 M. & W. 617.

In the one case, tithe was real property ; in the other, a chattel (*a*).

So, the 1 & 2 Vict. c. 110, s. 13, which enacted that a judgment against any person should operate as a charge on "lands, rectories, advowsons, tithes," and hereditaments in which the judgment debtor had an interest, was held to be limited to the property of debtors who had the power of charging their property, that is, to lay rectories, advowsons, and tithes, and so did not conflict with or repeal by implication the 13 Eliz. c. 10, which makes void all chargings of ecclesiastical property in ecclesiastical hands (*b*). The Act which provides one course of proceeding for the habitual neglect to send a child to school, does not conflict with another which provides a different mode of proceeding for a neglect which was not habitual but occasional only, and both therefore can stand (*c*). The 55 Geo. III. c. 137, which imposed a penalty of £100, recoverable by the common informer by action, on any parish officer who, for his own profit, supplied goods for the use of a workhouse, or for the support

- (*a*) *Ely* (Dean of) *v. Bliss*, 2 175. *Comp. R. v. Everett*, 1
De G. M. & G. 459. See also *E. & B.* 273 ; *Re Knight*, 1 *Ex.*
R. v. Everett, 1 *E. & B.* 273 ; 802 ; *Irish Land Commission v.*
Adey v. Trinity House, 22 *L. J.* Grant, 10 *App. Cas.* 14.
Q. B. 3, *S. C.* ; *Hunt v. Gt.* (*b*) *Hawkins v. Gathercole*,
Northern R. Co., 10 *C. B.* 900 ; 6 *De G. M. & G.* 1.
Grant v. Ellis, 9 *M. & W.* 113 ; (*c*) *Re Murphy*, 2 *Q. B. D.*
Manning v. Phelps, 10 *Ex.* 59 ; 397. See another illustration in
Horden v. Hesketh, 4 *H. & N.* *Exp. Attwater*, 5 *Ch. D.* 27.

of the poor, was held unaffected by the 4 & 5 Will. IV. c. 76, s. 77, which inflicted a fine of £5, recoverable summarily, half for the informer and half for the poor rates, on any such officer who supplied goods for his profit to an individual pauper (*a*). It had been decided before the passing of the later Act (which, indeed, was passed in consequence of that decision), that the earlier enactment applied only to a supply for the poor generally, but not to the supply of an individual pauper (*b*). The prohibition contained in the Trade Union Act, 1871, against a Court entertaining any legal proceedings for the purpose of enforcing an agreement for the application of the funds of a trade union to provide benefits for members, has been held not to be impliedly repealed by the provision of the Trade Union Act Amendment Act, 1876, that a member may nominate any person to receive any moneys due to such member from his trade union on his decease, and that the trade union shall pay such sum to the nominee; the object of the later enactment being, not to depart from the policy of the earlier one, but to enable members to give away small sums due to them, without incurring the trouble of making a will, or the expense of probate (*c*).

The 56 Geo. III. c. 50 (relating to the sale of farm-

(*a*) Robinson v. Emerson, 4
H. & C. 352.

(*b*) Proctor v. Manwaring, 3
B. & Ald. 145.

(*c*) 34 & 35 Vict. c. 31, s. 4,
and 39 & 40 Vict. c. 22, s. 10;
Crocker v. Knight, [1892] 1 Q.
B. 702.

stock in execution), in providing that no assignee in bankruptcy or under a bill of sale, and no purchaser of farm stock, should be entitled to dispose of any stock intended for use on the land in any other manner than the tenant ought to have disposed of it, was limited in construction to the purchases from tenants; but as not affecting the 2 & 3 W. & M. c. 5, which imposes on the landlord the obligation of selling distrained goods at the best price, and therefore as not justifying him in selling under the conditions of the 56 Geo. III. (a). The later Act showed no intention to modify the law of distress.

So, an Act which imposes, for police purposes, a penalty for retailing excisable liquors without a magistrate's license, would not be affected by an excise Act of later date, which, after imposing a duty on persons licensed by magistrates, provided that nothing which it contained should prohibit a person duly licensed to retail beer, from carrying on his business in a booth or tent, at a fair or race (b). The 1 Will. IV. c. 64, which imposes on beer retailers licensed by the Excise, a penalty of from £10 to £20, on conviction before justices, for selling beer made otherwise than of malt and hops, or for mixing any drugs with it, or for diluting it, was held not to affect the 56 Geo. III. c.

(a) *Ridgway v. Stafford*, 6 519; *R. v. Downes*, 3 T. R. Ex. 404; *Wilmot v. Rose*, 3 E. 560. See *Buckle v. Wrightson*, & B. 563; *Hawkins v. Walrond*, 5 B. & S. 854; and *Ash v. 1 C. P. D. 280.*

Lynn, L. R. 1 Q. B. 270.

(b) *R. v. Hanson*, 4 B. & A.

58, which punished with a penalty of £200 any retailer of beer who had in his possession, or put into his beer, any colouring matter or preparation in lieu of malt and hops; partly because the objects of the two enactments were not identical, the later one having solely a sanitary object in view, and the protection of the consumer; while the earlier was aimed as much at the repression of frauds on the revenue (*a*). It is to be added, also, that the 56 Geo. III. c. 58, was expressly kept in force by the 1 Will. IV. c. 51, passed a week before the 1 Will. IV. c. 64.

Where a general intention is expressed, and also a particular intention which is incompatible with the general one, the particular intention is considered an exception to the general one (*b*). Even when the later, or later part of the enactment is in the negative, it is sometimes reconcilable with the earlier one by so treating it. If, for instance, an Act in one section authorised a corporation to sell a particular piece of land, and in another prohibited it to sell "any land," the first section would be treated not as repealed by the sweeping terms of the other, but as an exception to it (*c*). In this manner two Acts passed in 1833 were construed as reconcilable.

(*a*) *Atty.-Gen. v. Lockwood*, 16 M. & W. 615; *Taylor v. 9 M. & W. 378*. See *Palmer v. Oldham*, 4 Ch. D. 395.

Thatcher, 3 Q. B. D. 346.

(*c*) *Per Romilly M.R. in De*

(*b*) *Per Best C.J. in Churchill Winton v. Brecon*, 28 L. J. Ch. v. Crease, 5 Bing. 180. And 600.

see *ex. gr. Pilkington v. Cooke*,

The 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 27, s. 42, which provided that no action for rent, or for interest on money charged on land should be brought after six years, and the 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 42, passed three weeks later, which provided that no action for rent reserved by lease under seal, or for money secured by bond or other specialty, should be brought after twenty years, were construed as reconcilable, by holding that the later enactment was an exception out of the former. And the effect of the conjoined enactments was that no more than six years' arrears of rent or interest were recoverable, except where they were secured by covenant or other specialty, in which case twenty years' arrears were recoverable (*a*).

It may be observed, also, that two statutes expressed in negative terms may be affirmative inter se, and not contradictory, though negative as regards a third at which they are avowedly aimed. They may make two holes in the earlier Act, which can stand side by side without merging into one (*b*). For instance, the

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Hunter v. Nockolds</i>, 1 McN. & Gord, 640 (but see <i>Sutton v. Sutton</i>, 22 Ch. D. 511, <i>per</i> Cotton L.J. at p. 518); <i>Paget v. Foley</i>, 2 Bing. N. C. 679; <i>Sims v. Thomas</i>, 12 A. & E. 536; <i>Humfrey v. Gery</i>, 7 C. B. 567. See also <i>Re Smith</i>, [1893] 2 Ch. 1; <i>Re Deere</i>, L. R. 10 Ch. 658;</p> | <p><i>Richens v. Wiggins</i>, 3 B. & S. 953. <i>Comp. Round v. Bell</i>, 30 Beav. 121. Rent is a specialty debt within the 32 & 33 Vict. c. 46, in the administration of assets, <i>Talbot v. Shrewsbury</i>, L. R. 16 Eq. 26; <i>Re Hastings</i>, 6 Ch. D. 610.</p> <p>(<i>b</i>) <i>Per</i> Maule J. in <i>Clack v. Sainsbury</i>, 11 C. B. 695.</p> |
|--|--|

12 Anne, st. 2, c. 16, having made void all loans at more than five per cent., the 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 98, enacted that "no" bill or note payable at three months or less should be void for usury; and the 2 & 3 Vict. c. 37, that "no" bill or note payable at twelve months or less should be void on that ground, but with the additional provision that the Act was not to apply to loans on real security; and it was held that the last-mentioned Act did not repeal the 3 & 4 Will. IV. The negative words, in which both were expressed, had reference to the Act of Anne; but inter se, they were affirmative statutes, and the proviso of the later one, therefore, did not affect the short loans dealt with by the Act of William IV. (a).

Further, it is laid down generally, that when the later enactment is worded in affirmative terms only, without any negative expressed or implied, it does not repeal the earlier law (b). Thus, an Act which authorised the Quarter Sessions to try a certain offence, would involve no inconsistency with an earlier one which enacted that the offence should be tried by the Queen's Bench or the Assizes, and would therefore not repeal it by implication (c). The statute which makes it a misdemeanour to carnally know a

(a) *Clack v. Sainsbury*, ubi
sup.; *Nixon v. Phillips*, 7 Ex.
188; *Exp. Warrington*, 3 De
G. M. & G. 159.

(b) *Co. Litt.* 115a, *Anon.*
Lofft, 465.

(c) *Muir v. Hore*, 47 L. J.
M. C. 17.

girl above twelve and under thirteen, with or without her consent, did not prevent a conviction for rape, under an earlier enactment, upon a girl between those ages (*a*). The 7 & 8 Will. III. c. 34, s. 4, which provided that when a Quaker refused to pay tithe or church rates, it should be lawful for two justices to order and enforce payment if the sum due was under £10, was held not to repeal the 27 Hen. VIII., which gave jurisdiction to the Ecclesiastical Courts in such matters (*b*). Section 11 of the Lunacy Regulation Act, 1862, which enables the Lord Chancellor to make an order for the payment of the expenses incidental to the presentation of a petition for an inquiry as to the sanity of an alleged lunatic, and to order that such expenses be paid by the parties who either present or oppose the petition, or out of the estate of the alleged lunatic, does not take away the right of a person to sue a lunatic, so found by inquisition, and his committee, for the recovery of expenses so incurred, without having obtained any order (*c*). So, an Act

(*a*) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 48, and 38 & 39 Vict. c. 94, s. 4; *R. v. Ratcliffe*, 10 Q. B. D. 74.

(*b*) *R. v. Sanchee*, 1 Lord Raym. 323. Many of the clergy, in the 18th century, persisted, in consequence, in suing Quakers in the Ecclesiastical Courts for such trivial sums as 4s. or 5s. in order to inflict heavy costs and

imprisonment. Walpole tried to alter the law, but the Church cried out that it would be persecution to compel the clergy to recover before magistrates a due of divine origin. Lecky, *Hist. Eng. in 18th Cent.*, vol. i. p. 260.

(*c*) 25 & 26 Vict. c. 86, s. 11; *Brockwell v. Bullock*, 22 Q. B. D. 567.

which imposes a liability on certain persons to repair a road, would not be construed as impliedly exonerating the parish from its common law duty to do so (*a*). A bye-law which authorised the election of "any person" as Chamberlain of the City of London was not deemed inconsistent with an earlier one which required of the candidates a certain qualification, but was limited to eligible persons (*b*). A local Act, in directing that the chimneys of buildings should be built of such materials as the Corporation approved, did not affect the provisions of the earlier general Act (3 & 4 Vict. c. 85, s. 6), which required that chimneys should be built of stone or brick (*c*). A bye-law made under the 74th section of the Education Act, requiring children to attend school as long as it was open (which was at least thirty hours in the week), did not repeal the provision in the Workshops Regulation Act of 1869, which requires that children under thirteen employed in a workshop shall be sent to school for at least ten hours weekly (*d*). An Act which provided that if a person suffered bodily injury from the neglect of a mill-owner to fence dangerous machinery, after notice to do so from a factory inspector, the mill-owner should be liable to a penalty,

- | | |
|---|---|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>R. v. St. George's Hanover Square</i> , 3 Camp. 222; <i>R. v. Southampton</i> , 21 L. J. M. C. 201; <i>Gibson v. Preston</i> , L. R. 5 Q. B. 218. | <i>Woodroffe</i> , 7 B. & C. 838. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Tobacco Pipe Makers v.</i> | (<i>c</i>) <i>Hill v. Hall</i> , 1 Ex. D. 411. |
| | (<i>d</i>) 30 & 31 Vict. c. 146, s. 14; <i>Bury v. Cherryholm</i> , 1 Ex. D. 457. |

recoverable by the inspector, and applicable to the party injured or otherwise, as the Home Secretary should determine, would not affect the common law right of the injured party to sue for damages for the injury (*a*). A bond by a collector, with one surety, good under the ordinary law, would not be deemed invalid because the Act which required it enacted that the collector should give good security by a joint and several bond with two sureties at least (*b*).

The 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142, which authorises a judge of the Superior Court in which an action is brought, to send the case for trial to a County Court, was construed as not impliedly repealing the earlier enactment of 11 Geo. IV. c. 70, which authorises any judge of the Superior Courts to transact the chamber business of the other Courts as well as his own; but the later Act was read with the earlier, and the expression "Judge of the Court in which the action was brought," was thus construed as equivalent to any judge of any of the Superior Courts of law (*c*). The 55 Geo. III. c. 184, s. 52, which directed that all affidavits required by existing or future Acts for the verification of accounts should, unless when otherwise expressly provided, be made before the Commissioners

(*a*) 7 & 8 Vict. c. 15; *Caswell v. Worth*, 5 E. & B. 849. See *Ald. 431. See Austen v. Howard*, 7 Taunt. 28, 327.

Ambergate R. Co. v. Midland R. Co., 2 E. & B. 793. (*c*) *Owens v. Woosman*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 469.

(*b*) *Peppin v. Cooper*, 2 B. &

of Stamps, was held unaffected by the 9 Geo. IV. c. 23, which empowered justices of the peace to administer the oath in similar cases. Although the later Act did "otherwise provide," it did not make the provision inconsistent with the earlier Act (*a*). The Highway Act, 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 50, which enacted that no action for anything done under it should be begun until twenty-one days' notice of action had been given, did not repeal, as regards the notice of action to justices, the 24 Geo. II. c. 44, s. 1, which gave justices the privilege of a month's notice when sued for anything done in the execution of their office (*b*); though, as already mentioned, it was at the same time held to repeal the provision of the same Act which limited the time to six months.

The 28 Hen. VIII. c. 11, which gave the curate who served during a vacancy, an action for his stipend against the next incumbent, remained unaffected by the 1 & 2 Vict. c. 106, which enacted that on the avoidance of a benefice, the stipend of the curate during the vacancy, fixed by the bishop, should be paid by the sequestrator; both Acts being in the affirmative, and not so inconsistent as to be incompatible with both standing (*c*); though the later Act suggested ground for contending that as a Court of law could not determine what the salary should be, it

(*a*) *R. v. Greenland*, L. R. 1 470. See sup., 217-218.
C. C. 65. (*c*) *Dakins v. Seaman*, 9 M.
(*b*) *Rix v. Borton*, 12 A. & E. & W. 777.

was not competent to assist the curate in recovering any (a). Where one Bankruptcy Act empowered the Court to make the bankrupt an allowance, and a later one enacted that the creditors should determine whether any and what allowance should be made to him, it was held that the former power was still in force when the creditors did not exercise that given them by the later Act (b). The 38 Hen. VIII. c. 9, s. 2, which prohibited on pain of forfeiture of any "pretended" rights or titles to land, which included all rights of entry, for these were not transferable at common law, was not impliedly repealed as regards fictitious rights of entry by the 8 & 9 Vict. c. 106, s. 6, which enacted that rights of entry might be disposed of by deed. But it was so far repealed as to cease to affect good and real rights of entry (c).

Where a power was given by a local Act to commissioners to make drains through private lands, after giving twenty-eight days' public notice, with power to the persons interested to appeal; and the subsequently passed Nuisances Removal Act of 1855 gave the same power to the same commissioners, without requiring notice, it was held that they were at liberty to act under either statute. The notice was not a right given to the parties interested, but a mere restriction; and there was no more inconsistency in

(a) *Per Parke B.*, Id. 789.

(c) *Jenkins v. Jones*, 9 Q. B.

(b) *Exp. Ellerton*, 33 L. J. D. 128.

Bank. 32.

the co-existence of the two powers, than in the co-existence of the ordinary covenants in a lease to repair simply, and to repair after a month's notice (*a*). Where an Act imposed a duty of 35s. on the transfer of a mortgage, and a second provided that when the transfer was made by several deeds, only 5s. should be charged on all but the first, and a third Act repealed the first by imposing a stamp of sixpence per £100, it was held that the second Act was not impliedly repealed by the third (*b*).

The Thames Conservancy Act of 1857, which makes the owner of a vessel navigating the Thames responsible for damage done to the Conservators' property, by any of the boatmen "or other persons belonging "to or employed in" the vessel, was held not to affect the provision of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854, s. 353, which protects owners from liability, where the damage is occasioned by the fault of a compulsorily employed pilot, who, therefore, was not included in the words "other persons" (*c*). The 33 Geo. III. c. 54, which protected members of friendly societies from removal until they became actually chargeable, was not impliedly repealed by the 35 Geo. III. c. 101, which extended that protection to all poor persons ;

(*a*) *Derby v. Bury Commissioners*, L. R. 4 Ex. 222 ; comp. however, such cases as *Cumberland v. Copeland*, 1 H. & C. 194, inf.

(*b*) *Foley v. Commissioners of Inland Revenue*, L. R. 3 Ex. 263.

(*c*) *Conservators of the Thames v. Hall*, L. R. 3 C. P. 415.

for though the latter seemed to supersede the former by making it unnecessary, yet it differed from it in declaring that an unmarried woman pregnant was to be deemed chargeable, while under the earlier Act, the pregnant daughter of a member of a friendly society was not removable (*a*). The 17 Geo. II. c. 38, s. 4, which empowered the Quarter Sessions, upon an appeal against a poor rate, to order costs to be paid to the successful party, was held unrepealed by the 12 & 13 Vict. c. 45, s. 5, which, in substance, empowered the Quarter Sessions to direct the unsuccessful party to pay the costs of the successful party to the clerk of the peace, who was to pay them over to the successful party; so that the order for costs might be made in either form. (*b*).

The Acts 43 Eliz. c. 6, 21 Jac. c. 16, and 22 & 23 Car. II. c. 9, having provided that a plaintiff in an action for slander, who recovered less than 40s. damages, was to be entitled only to as much costs as the damages amounted to; the 3 & 4 Vict. c. 24, after expressly repealing the first and third of those Acts, without mentioning the second, enacted that a plaintiff who, in such cases, recovered less damage than 40s., should not be entitled to any costs, unless the presiding judge certified that the slander was malicious; and it was held that this

(*a*) *R. v. Idle*, 2 B. & Ald. 149. S. 425; comp. *R. v. Hellier*, 17

(*b*) *R. v. Huntley*, 3 E. & B. Q. B. 229.

172; *Gay v. Matthews*, 4 B. &

later enactment did not impliedly repeal the 21 Jac. c. 16, and that the effect of the judge's certificate was merely to remit the plaintiff to the rights which that statute gave him (*a*). The 5 Vict. c. 27, which, after reciting that it would be advantageous to ecclesiastical benefices if incumbents were empowered to grant leases with the consent and under the restrictions mentioned in the Act, gave them power to grant, with the consent of the patron, leases for fourteen years at the best rent, and with numerous special covenants by the lessee, was held not to abridge the power which every parson had at common law, as modified by the 13 Eliz. c. 10, to grant leases for twenty-one years or three lives, the lease being confirmed by the patron (*b*).

SECTION III.—GENERALIA SPECIALIBUS NON DEROGANT.

It is but a particular application of the general presumption against an intention to alter the law beyond

(*a*) *Evans v. Rees*, 9 C. B. 16 East, 374; *R. v. Pinney*, 2 N. S. 391; *Marshall v. Martin*, B. & C. 322; *R. v. Medway*, L. R. 5 Q. B. 239. See also *Union*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 383; *Davies v. Griffiths*, 4 M. & W. Northwich *v. St. Pancras*, 22 Q. B. D. 164; *Mitford Union v. Wayland Union*, 25 Q. B. D. 377, and *Wrightup v. Greenacre*, 10 Q. B. 1.

(*b*) *Green v. Jenkins*, 1 De 164; *Pollock v. Lands Improvement Company*, 37 Ch. G. F. & G. 454. See other illustrations in *Lester's Case*, D. 661.

the immediate scope of the statute, to say that a general Act is to be construed as not repealing a particular one, that is, one directed towards a special object or a special class of objects (*a*). A general later law does not abrogate an earlier special one by mere implication (*b*). *Generalia specialibus non derogant* (*c*); the law does not allow the exposition to revoke or alter, by construction of general words, any particular statute, where the words may have their proper operation without it (*d*). It is usually presumed to have only general cases in view, and not particular cases which have been already otherwise provided for by the special Act, or, what is the same thing, by a local custom (*e*). Having already given its attention to the particular subject, and provided for it, the Legislature is reasonably presumed not to intend to alter that special provision by a subsequent general enactment, unless that intention is manifested

(*a*) *Per* Lord Hatherley, in *Garnett v. Bradley*, 3 App. Cas. 950.

(*b*) *Thorpe v. Adams*, L. R. 6 C. P. 125; *R. v. Champneys*, Id. 384; *Kutner v. Phillips*, *per* A. L. Smith J., [1891] 2 Q. B. 267.

(*c*) Jenk. 3rd Cent. 41st Case.

(*d*) *Seward v. The Vera Cruz*, *per* Lord Selborne L.C., 10 App. Cas. at p. 68; *Hawkins v. Gathercole*, *per* Turner L.J., 6

D. M. & G. at p. 31; *Lyn v. Wyn*, Bridg. 122; *per* M. Smith J. in *Conserv. Thames v. Hall*, L. R. 3 C. P. 421, and *Bramwell B. in Dodds v. Shepherd*, 1 Ex. D. 75.

(*e*) Co. Litt. 115a; *Harbert's Case*, 3 Rep. 13b, note U.; *Gregory's Case*, 6 Rep. 19b; *R. v. Pugh*, 1 Doug. 188; *Hutchins v. Player*, Bridg. 272; *Platt v. Sheriffs of London*, Plowd. 36.

in explicit language (*a*), or there be something which shows that the attention of the Legislature had been turned to the special Act, and that the general one was intended to embrace the special cases within the previous one (*b*); or something in the nature of the general one making it unlikely that an exception was intended as regards the special Act. The general statute is read as silently excluding from its operation the cases which have been provided for by the special one.

Thus, the rules of the Supreme Court as to costs do not operate to repeal the provisions of special statutes giving special costs in particular cases (*c*); and the Bills of Sale Acts requiring the registration of agreements by which a right to a charge or security on personal chattels is conferred, language clearly wide enough to include debentures of a joint stock company, were held not to include such instruments, as the registration of them had been otherwise provided for by the Companies Clauses Act, 1845, and the Companies Act, 1862 (*d*). The Admiralty Court Act, 1861, s. 7, which gives jurisdiction to that Court "over any claim for damages done by any

(*a*) *Per* Wood V.C. in *Fitzgerald v. Champneys*, 2 Jo. & H. 54.

(*b*) *Per* Lord Hatherley in *Garnett v. Bradley*, 9 App. Cas. 944; and see *per* Cur. in *R. v. Poor Law Com.*, 6 A. & E. 48.

(*c*) *Reeve v. Gibson*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 652; *Hasker v. Wood*, 54 L. J. Q. B. 419.

(*d*) 41 & 42 Vict. c. 31, 45 & 46 Vict. c. 43, 8 Vict. c. 16, 25 & 26 Vict. c. 89; *Exp. Lowe*, [1891] 1 Ch. 627.

“ship,” has been held not to authorise an action for damages for loss of life under Lord Campbell’s Act; actions under that Act being in respect of a special class of claims involving numerous and important considerations, which the Legislature cannot be supposed to have had in contemplation in using words of so general a character (a). So when a local Act, for completing a bridge across the Thames, exempted the owners of the adjoining ground, which was to be embanked at their expense, from all taxes and assessments whatsoever, it was held that later general Acts imposing taxes and rates in respect of lands and houses, did not repeal that exemption (b). After the 13 Eliz. c. 10 had declared all leases of ecclesiastical property void, other than for twenty-one years or three lives, leases of house property in towns were excepted from its operation by the 14 Eliz. c. 11; and when, four years later, the 18 Eliz. c. 11, after reciting that a practice had already begun of granting reversionary leases of Church property, enacted that “all leases hereafter “to be made” by ecclesiastics, of Church “lands, tenements and hereditaments,” should be void, if the old lease was not expired or determined within three years from the grant of the new; it was held that

(a) 9 & 10 Vict. c. 93, 24 Eddington v. Borman, 4 T. R. Vict. c. 10; Seward v. The 2 and 4. See Duncan v. Sc. N. Vera Cruz, 10 App. Cas. 59. E. R. Co., L. R. 2 Sc. App. 20.

(b) Williams v. Pritchard and

this last Act did not apply to the property dealt with by the 14 Eliz. (a). So the general provision of the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, which gave power to a married woman to dispose by will of any real or personal property in the same manner as if she were a feme sole, has been held not to override the special provision of 43 Geo. III. c. 108, which enacts that the powers conferred by that Act of making a gift by will for the purpose of erecting a church shall not extend to the case of a married woman acting without the concurrence of her husband (b).

Where an Act took away the right of bringing an action respecting certain disputes, which were referred to the summary adjudication of justices; it was held that the subsequently established County Courts acquired no jurisdiction to try such cases, under the general authority to try "all pleas" (c).

The provision of the Judicature Act of 1875, that except where it is otherwise provided by the Act or the rules annexed to it, the judgment of the Court shall be obtained by motion, was held not to affect the County Courts Act of 1856, which, after authorising the Superior Courts to send certain cases to the County Courts for trial, had directed that the judg-

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) <i>Per</i> Sir O. Bridgman in | been equally divided. |
| <i>Lyn v. Wyn</i> , Bridg. R. by | (b) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 75, s. 1; |
| Bannister, 122. This case is | <i>Re</i> Smith's Estate, 35 Ch. D. |
| not reported in the original | 589. |
| edition of Bridgman's judgments, | (c) <i>Exp. Payne</i> , 5 D. & L. |
| and the Court seems to have | 679. |

ment might be signed in accordance with the result as certified by the registrar (*a*). The general provisions of Order LIX., rr. 10-17, as to appeals to the Queen's Bench Division from inferior Courts, do not repeal the special provisions of s. 8 of the Mayor's Court Act, 1857, as to imposing the obligation on the party appealing from that Court in certain cases to give security for costs (*b*).

The General Turnpike Act, 3 Geo. IV. c. 126, which empowered turnpike trustees to let the tolls, and provided that all contracts for letting them should be valid, though not by deed, "any Acts of Parliament "or law to the contrary thereof notwithstanding," was held unaffected by the 8 & 9 Vict. c. 106, which in the most general terms declares that "a lease, "required by law to be in writing, of any tenements "and hereditaments, shall be void unless made by "deed." It was not to be supposed that the Legislature intended by the later Act to interfere with the policy of the earlier one, which was emphatically that a deed should not be required for turnpike tolls (*c*), though necessary by the general law of the land (*d*). An Act which declared all debtors to be subject to the bankruptcy laws, would include debtors who had the

- (*a*) 39 & 40 Vict. c. 77, Q. B. 236.
 Order 40, r. 1; 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108; *Scott v. Freeman*, 2 Q. B. 316.
 D. 177. (*d*) *R. v. Salisbury*, 8 A. & E. 716.
 (*b*) 20 & 21 Vict. c. 157, s. 8; *Morgan v. Bowles*, [1894] 1

privilege of Parliament from personal arrest ; but any provisions of those Acts which authorised the arrest of bankrupts would be held inapplicable to a person entitled to the privilege. Unless it expressed a contrary intention plainly, it would be presumed that the Legislature did not intend to interfere with it (a).

Personal Acts and local customs affecting only certain persons in their rights, privileges, or property, offer other illustrations of this rule, that special enactments are unaffected by the general words of a more general enactment. Thus, the Act abolishing fines and recoveries which, in the most comprehensive terms, authorises "every tenant in tail" to bar his entail in a certain manner, does not apply to the tenant in tail of property entailed by special Act of Parliament, such as the Shrewsbury, Marlborough, Wellington, and other special Parliamentary entails (b). And in the same way, the 1 & 2 Vict. c. 110, which in general terms enacted that a judgment of a Superior Court shall operate as a charge on the lands of the debtor from the time of its registration in the Common Pleas, was held not to repeal by implication the Middlesex Registration Act, which had enacted that no judgment should bind lands in Middlesex, but from the time of its registration in the

(a) *Newcastle v. Morris*, L. R. H. 54. See *Abergavenny v. Brace*, L. R. 7 Ex. 145 ; and 4 H. L. 661.

(b) *Per Wood V.C. in Fitzgerald v. Champneys*, 2 Jo. & comp. *Re Cuckfield Board*, 19 Beav. 153.

register office for Middlesex (*a*). An Act which authorised "any person" to sell beer, who obtained a license for the purpose, would not be construed as repealing the custom or local law of a borough which disqualified all persons who were not burgesses from selling beer (*b*). An Act which required all persons to serve as jurors of the county, in general terms, would not be construed as extending to a hundred, when those who served as jurors in the hundred were by custom exempted from service in the county (*c*). So, the 50 Geo. III. c. 41, which empowered licensed hawkers to set up in any trade in the place where they resided, was held not to give them that privilege in a borough where, by custom or bye-law, strangers were not allowed to trade (*d*). Where a railway company had authority, under a special Act, to take certain lands in the metropolis for executing their works on them, it was held that its powers were unaffected by the Metropolis Local Management Act, 18 & 19 Vict. c. 120, which was passed shortly afterwards, giving

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) 1 & 2 Vict. c. 110, ss. 13 & 19; 7 Anne, c. 20, s. 18; Westbrook <i>v.</i> Blythe, 3 E. & B. 737. See also Dale's Case, 6 Q. B. D. 376; Enraght <i>v.</i> Ld. Penzance, 7 App. Cas. 240; Fritz <i>v.</i> Hobson, 14 Ch. D. 542.</p> <p>(<i>b</i>) Leicester <i>v.</i> Burgess, 5 B. & Ad. 246; 11 Geo. IV. & 1 Will. IV. c. 64, s. 29; comp.</p> | <p>Huxham <i>v.</i> Wheeler, 3 H. & C. 75; Hutchins <i>v.</i> Player, Bridg. 272.</p> <p>(<i>c</i>) R. <i>v.</i> Pugh, Doug. 188; R. <i>v.</i> St. James's Westminster, 5 A. & E. 391; R. <i>v.</i> Johnson, 6 Cl. & F. 41.</p> <p>(<i>d</i>) Simson <i>v.</i> Moss, 2 B. & Ad. 543; Llandaff Market Co. <i>v.</i> Lyndon, 8 C. B. N. S. 515.</p> |
|--|---|

the same powers to a public body (*a*). So, an Act which authorised the lord of a manor and his heirs to break up the pavement of the streets of a town, for the purpose of laying down water-pipes to convey water to and through the town, from his estate, would not be affected by a subsequent Act which vested the same streets and pavements in a public body, and empowered it to sue any person who broke them up (*b*).

In all these cases, the general Act seemed intended to apply to general cases only ; and there was nothing to rebut that presumption. But if there be in the Act or in its history something showing that the attention of the Legislature had been turned to the earlier special Act, and that it intended to embrace the special cases within the general Act, or something in the nature of either Act, to render it unlikely that any exception was intended in favour of the special Act, the maxim under consideration ceases to be applicable. The Prescription Act, 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 71, for example, in giving an indefeasible right to light after an enjoyment of twenty years, "notwithstanding "any local custom," plainly abolished the custom of London which authorised the owner of an ancient

(*a*) London and Blackwall R. 161, sup., p. 225.

Co. v. Limehouse Board, 3 Kay (b) Goldson v. Buck, 15 East,
& Johns. 123 ; comp. Daw v. 372.
Metrop. Board, 12 C. B. N. S.

house to build a new one on its old foundations to any height, though thereby obscuring the ancient lights of his neighbour (*a*). It has been held that the Dower (*b*) and Inclosure (*c*) Acts apply to gavelkind lands, though this local customary tenure is not expressly mentioned in either Act. Though the sheriffs of the Counties Palatine of Lancaster and Durham were expressly forbidden by the 7 & 8 Geo. IV. c. 71, to arrest on mesne process issuing from the Courts of Westminster, for less than £50, this enactment was held repealed by the 1 & 2 Vict. c. 110, which after abolishing generally all arrests for debt, gave a judge power, under certain circumstances, to order such an arrest in every action for any sum for £20 or upwards (*d*). The Mortmain Act was held to extend to a corporate body which had been empowered by an earlier Act to take land by devise and without license, in mortmain (*e*). So, the general Lands Clauses Act of 1845, which authorises the compulsory taking of lands for works of public utility, such as railways, and gives corresponding powers to tenants in tail or for life, to convey the

- (*a*) *Salters' Co. v. Jay*, 3 Q. & W. 196.
B. 109; *R. v. Mayor of London*, 13 Q. B. 1; *Merchant Taylors v. Truscott*, 11 Ex. 855. (*e*) *Luckraft v. Pridham*, 6 Ch. D. 205. See also *Morrison v. Genl. Steam Navig. Co.*, 22 L. J. Ex. 233, and see also *per Jessel M.R. in Mersey Docks v. Lucas*, 51 L. J. Q. B. 116; *Gardner v. Whitford*, 4 C. B. M. & G. 340.
- (*b*) *Farley v. Bonham*, 2 Jo. & H. 177; and see *sup.*, p. 38.
- (*c*) *Minet v. Leman*, 7 De G. M. & G. 340.
- (*d*) *Brown v. McMillan*, 7 M. N. S. 665.

lands so required, would apply to tenants in tail under special Parliamentary entails, such as the Abergavenny entail (*a*). The County Courts acquired jurisdiction, under their general authority to hear "all pleas" where the debt or damage did not exceed £20, to enforce the payment of a rate imposed under a local Act passed before those Courts were established, and which had made such rates recoverable only by action in the Superior Courts (*b*). A local Act which provided that the prisoners of the borough to which it applied, and which had a separate Quarter Sessions, should be maintained in the county jail on certain specified terms, was held to be superseded by the General Act, 5 & 6 Vict. c. 95, which enacted that every borough, which had Quarter Sessions, should, when its prisoners were sent to the county jail, pay the county the expenses, including those of repairs and improvements (*c*). The provision in the Metropolis Local Management Act, 1854, that the magistrate's decision on matters under that Act shall be final and conclusive was impliedly repealed by the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, which authorises any person questioning a decision of a Court of Summary Jurisdiction to apply for a case to be stated (*d*).

Where a City gas company had been precluded by

- | | |
|--|--|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Re</i> Cuckfield Board, 19 | E. & B. 246. |
| Beav. 153. | (<i>d</i>) 18 & 19 Vict. c. 120, s. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Stuart v. Jones</i> , 1 E. & | 129, and 42 & 43 Vict. c. 49, s. |
| B. 22. | 33 ; <i>R. v. Bridge</i> , 24 Q. B. D. |
| (<i>c</i>) <i>Bramston v. Colchester</i> , 6 | 357. |

its private Act from charging more than four shillings for every thousand feet of gas of a certain quality, and the Metropolis Gas Act of 1860 required the City gas companies to supply a better and more expensive gas at the rate prescribed by it, which might amount to five shillings per thousand feet; it was held that the later provision impliedly repealed the earlier prohibition. Here, however, the general Act avowedly applied to the company; and it would have been unreasonable that the better gas which it required, should be supplied at the price mentioned in the special Act, merely because the latter had not been repealed in express terms (a).

The Metropolitan Police Act, 2 & 3 Vict. c. 71, s. 47, which provided that penalties under existing and future Acts, which should be adjudged by police magistrates, should be paid to the receiver of the police district, and the subsequent Act, 17 & 18 Vict. c. 38 (against gaming houses), which enacted that the penalties which it inflicted should be recoverable before two justices (or before a police magistrate, since he has the same jurisdiction as two justices), and should be paid to the overseers of the poor of the parish in which the offence was committed, were construed so as to be consistent with each other, by limiting the application of the penalties under the later Act, to cases where they were imposed by

(a) *Great Central Gas Co. v. See also Parry v. Croydon Gas*
Clarke, 13 C. B. N. S. 838. *Co.*, 15 C. B. N. S. 568.

justices, and applying them in conformity with the earlier statute, where they were adjudged by a police magistrate (*a*).

Where a general Act is incorporated into a special one, the provisions of the latter would prevail over any of the former with which they were inconsistent (*b*). It may be added, also, that when an Act on one subject, such as highways, incorporates some of the provisions comprised in another relating to a different subject, such as poor rates, it does not thereby incorporate the modifications of those provisions which are subsequently made in the latter Act (*c*).

It has been said to be a rule that one private Act of Parliament cannot repeal another except by express enactment (*d*); but necessary implication must, no doubt, be considered as involved in this expression (*e*), if the intention of the Legislature be so manifested. If the later of the two Acts be inconsistent with the continued existence of the earlier one, the latter must inevitably be abrogated (*f*).

(*a*) *Wray v. Ellis*, 1 E. & E. 276; and see *Receiver of Police District v. Bell*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 433.

(*b*) *Atty.-Gen. v. G. E. R. Co.*, L. R. 7 Ch. 475, L. R. 6 H. L. 367.

(*c*) *Bird v. Adcock*, 47 L. J. M. C. 123.

(*d*) *Per Turner L.J.* in

Birkenhead Docks v. Laird, 4 De G. M. & G. 732. See ex. gr. *Phipson v. Harvett*, 1 C. M. & R. 473, sup., p. 225.

(*e*) Comp. Lord Mansfield's dictum in *R. v. Abbot*, 2 Doug. 553, sup., p. 180.

(*f*) See ex. gr. *Daw v. Metrop. Board*, sup., p. 225. See *Green v. R.*, 1 App. Cas. 513.

SECTION IV.—IMPLIED REPEAL IN PENAL ACTS.

The question whether a new Act impliedly repeals an old one has frequently arisen in construing Acts which deal anew with existing offences without expressly referring to the past legislation respecting them. The problem often arises whether the manner in which the matter is dealt with in the later Act shows that the Legislature intended merely to make an amendment or addition to the existing law, or to treat the whole subject *de novo*, and so to make a *tabula rasa* of the pre-existing law. Of course, where the objects of the two Acts are not identical, each of them being restricted to its own object, no conflict takes place. Thus, an Act which empowered justices to commit for a month an apprentice guilty of any misconduct in his service, was not repealed by a later one which empowered them to compel an apprentice who absented himself to make compensation for his absence, and to commit him, in default, for three months (*a*). The object of the first Act was to punish the apprentice, while that of the other was to compensate the master. The 23 Eliz. c. 1, which imposed a monthly penalty of £20 to the Queen on recusants, was held not to repeal the earlier statute 1 Eliz. c. 2, which imposed a penalty of 12*d.* to the poor for every Sunday's omission to go to church (*b*). In this

(*a*) *Gray v. Cookson*, 16 East, 260.

13. *Comp. R. v. Youle*, *infra*, (b) *Foster's Case*, 11 Rep. 63b.

case, indeed, a later Act, 3 Jac. I., treated the first of Elizabeth as still in force.

It would seem that an Act which, without altering the nature of the offence, as by making it felony instead of misdemeanour, imposes a new kind of punishment, or provides a new course of procedure for that which was already an offence, at least at common law, is usually regarded as cumulative, and as not superseding the pre-existing law. For instance, though the 9 & 10 Will. III. c. 32, visits the offence of blasphemy with personal incapacities and imprisonment, an offender might also be indicted for the common law offence (*a*). The 2 W. & M. Sess. 2, c. 8, which prohibited keeping swine in houses in London on pain of the forfeiture of the swine so kept, did not abolish the liability to fine and imprisonment on indictment at common law for the nuisance (*b*). So, the 3 & 4 W. & M. c. 11, in imposing a penalty of £5, recoverable summarily, on parish officers who refused to receive a pauper removed to their parish by an order of justices, was held to leave those officers still liable to indictment for the common law offence of disobeying the order, which the justices had authority to make under the 13 & 14 Car. II. c. 12. In such cases, it is presumed that the Legislature knew that the offence was punishable by indictment, and that as it did not in express terms abolish the common law

(*a*) *R. v. Carlile*, 3 B. & Ald.
161.

(*b*) *R. v. Wigg*, 2 Salk.
460.

proceeding, it intended that the two remedies should co-exist (a). At all events, the change made by the new law was not of a character to justify the conclusion that there was any intention to abrogate the old; and in most of the examples cited, the presumption against an intention to oust the jurisdiction of the Superior Courts would strengthen it. Where an earlier statute (the Metropolitan Police Act, 1839) by one section (s. 57) empowered a magistrate to impose a penalty of not more than 40s. for an offence, and by another section (s. 77) empowered him if the penalty was not paid to commit the offender to prison for a month, and a later statute (the Street Music Act, 1864) repealed the former section, and substituted for it one empowering the magistrate to impose the same penalty or to commit to prison for not more than three days, it was held that this did not impliedly repeal the latter section, but it was competent for the magistrate to sentence an offender to pay a penalty of 40s., and in default of payment to be imprisoned for a month (b).

Under s. 33 of the Interpretation Act, 1889 (c), where an offence is punishable under more than one Act, or under an Act and at common law, the offender, unless the contrary intention appears, may

(a) *Stephens v. Watson*, 1 & 28 Vict. c. 55, s. 1; *R. v. Salk*, 45; *R. v. Robinson*, 2 Burr. Hopkins, [1893] 1 Q. B. 621.

800, *per* Lord Mansfield.

(c) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63.

(b) 2 & 3 Vict. c. 47, and 27

be punished under either, but shall not be punished twice for the same offence.

Where a statute alters the quality and incidents of an offence, as by making that which was a felony merely a misdemeanour, it would be construed as impliedly repealing the old law. Thus, the 16 Geo. III. c. 30, which imposed a pecuniary penalty merely, on persons who hunted or killed deer with their faces blackened, was held to have repealed the Black Act (9 Geo. I. c. 22), which made that offence capital (*a*).

Again, where the punishment or penalty is altered in degree but not in kind, the later provision would be considered as superseding the earlier one (*b*). Thus, the 5 Geo. I. c. 27, which imposed a fine of £100 and three months' imprisonment for a first offence, and fine at discretion and twelve months' imprisonment for the second, was held to be impliedly repealed by the 23 Geo. II. c. 13, which increased the punishment for the first offence to a fine of £500 and twelve months' imprisonment, and for the second to £1,000 and two years' imprisonment (*c*). So, it was held in *America* that a statute which punished the

(*a*) *R. v. Davis*, 1 Leach, 271. Lockwood, 9 M. & W. 391; See *per* Lord Esher M.R. in and *per* Martin B. in *Robinson Lee v. Dangar*, [1892] 2 Q. B. *v. Emerson*, 4 H. & C. 355; 348. *Cole v. Coulton*, 2 E. & B. 695.

(*b*) See *per* Lord Abinger in *Comp. Sims. v. Pay*, 58 L. J. *Henderson v. Sherborne*, 2 M. M. C. 39.

& W. 236, and *Atty.-Gen. v. (c) R. v. Cator*, 4 Burr, 2026.

rescue or harbour of a fugitive slave by a penalty of 500 dollars, recoverable by the owner for his own benefit, and reserved his right of action for damages, was repealed by a later enactment which imposed for the same offences a penalty of 1,000 dollars on conviction, and gave the party aggrieved 1,000 dollars by way of damages recoverable by action (a).

Indeed, it has been laid down generally, that if a later statute again describes an offence created by a former one, and affixes a different punishment to it, varying the procedure ; giving, for instance, an appeal where there was no appeal before, directing something more or something different, something more comprehensive ; the earlier statute is impliedly repealed by it (b). The 6 Geo. III. c. 25, which made an artificer or workman who absented himself from his employment, in breach of his contract, liable to three months' imprisonment, was held to be impliedly repealed by the 4 Geo. IV. c. 34, which punished not only that offence, but also that of not entering on the service, after having contracted in writing to serve, with three months' imprisonment, plus a proportional abatement of wages for the time of such imprisonment ; or in lieu

(a) *Norris v. Crocker*, 13 Youle *v. Mappin*, 30 L. J. M. Howard, 429. C. 237. *Comp. R. v. Hoseason*,

(b) *Per Cur.* in *Michell v. Brown*, 1 E. & E. 267 ; *per* 14 East, 605, and *per* Lord Hardwicke in *Middleton v. Bramwell B.* in *Re Baker*, 2 Crofts, 2 Atk. 674. H. & N. 219 ; *per* Martin B. in

thereof, with total or partial loss of his wages and discharge from service (a). So the 11th section of the 54 Geo. III. c. 159, which imposed a penalty of £10, leviable, not by distress, but by imprisonment, in default of immediate payment, on any person throwing ballast or rubbish out of a vessel into a harbour or river so as to tend to the obstruction of the navigation, and gave an appeal, was held to repeal by implication the earlier Act, 19 Geo. II. c. 22, which had imposed, without appeal, a penalty of not less than 50s. and not more than £5 for the same offence, leviable by distress, or imprisonment in default of distress. The preamble of the later Act, indeed, recited that it was expedient to "extend" the provisions of the earlier one, and though its implied repeal seems to have been thought at variance with such an intention, it may be questioned whether its provisions were not "extended" by what was, in effect, their re-enactment with an increased penalty and a summary method of its recovery (b). Where a local Act imposed on "all persons" engaged in making gas, who suffered impure matter to flow into any stream, a penalty of £200, recoverable by a common informer by action, and a further penalty of £20 for every day the nuisance was continued, payable to the informer or to the party injured, as the justices thought fit; and the

(a) *R. v. Youle*, 6 H. & N. 753; *Youle v. Mappin*, 30 L. J. 234, S. C. Comp. Owens v. Woosman, sup., 237. (b) *Michell v. Brown*, 1 E. & E. 267.

General Gasworks Clauses Act of 1847 afterwards imposed the same penalty on the “undertakers” of gasworks authorised by special Act, recoverable by the party injured; it was held that the earlier Act was repealed as regarded such undertakers (*a*). So an Act which imposed a penalty of not less than 40s. or more than £5 upon any owner or occupier who did not immediately remove certain projections from his house upon notice to do so, was held to be impliedly repealed by a later Act which imposed a penalty not exceeding £5 (without specifying any minimum), and a further penalty of 40s. a day for a continuance of the offence, upon any owner or occupier who did not after fourteen days’ notice remove such projection (*b*).

It has been observed by the Supreme Court of the United States, that in the interpretation of laws for the collection of revenue, whose provisions are often very complicated and numerous, in order to guard against frauds, it would be a strong proposition to assert that the main provisions of any such laws were repealed, merely because in subsequent laws other powers were given, and other modes of proceeding were provided,

(*a*) *Parry v. Croydon Gas Co.*, 15 C. B. N. S. 568. 170; *Summers v. Holborn Board of Works*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 612.

(*b*) 57 Geo. III. c. xxix. s. 72, 18 & 19 Vict. c. 120, s. 119; *Fortescue v. St. Matthew Bethnal Green*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 170; *But see Keep v. St. Mary’s Newington*, [1894] 2 Q. B. 524, and compare *Wyatt v. Gems*, [1893] 2 Q. B. 225.

to ascertain whether any frauds had been attempted. The more natural inference is that such new laws are auxiliary to the old (*a*).

But little weight can attach to the argument, that because an offence falls within two distinct enactments in their ordinary meaning, a secondary construction is to be sought in order to exclude it from one of the two. Thus, an enactment which prohibited under a penalty any person concerned in the administration of the poor laws from supplying goods ordered for the relief of any pauper, was not construed as excluding a poor law guardian, merely because another provision expressly made such officers liable to a much higher penalty for supplying the parish workhouse with goods (*b*). Where one section of an American Act enacted that no ship from a foreign port should unload any of its cargo but in open day, on pain of forfeiture of both goods and ship; and another prohibited the unloading of any ship bound for the United States, before she arrived at the proper place of discharge of her cargo, on pain of forfeiture of the unladen goods; it was held that a foreign ship bound for New York, and unloading a part of her cargo at night at an intermediate harbour in the United States, did not escape from falling within the former section, merely because it fell also within the latter. It was observed that there was no principle of law or interpre-

(*a*) *Per Cur. in U. S. v. Wood*, 16 Peters, 342.

(*b*) *Davies v. Harvey*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 433.

tation to authorise a Court to withdraw a case from the express prohibitions of one clause, on the ground that the offence was also punished by a different penalty in another. Neither could be held nugatory (*a*).

However, where a statute by one section empowered justices to order the abatement of a nuisance, punishing disobedience of their order with a fine of 10s. a day, and by another section empowered them to prohibit the recurrence of the nuisance under a penalty of 20s. a day, it was held in a case where orders had been made at different times under both sections, and two informations were laid for a breach of both by a fresh act of the same nuisance, that there could be only one conviction (*b*).

(*a*) *The Industry*, 1 Gallison,
114.

(*b*) 18 & 19 Vict. c. 121;
Eddlestone v. Barnes, 1 Ex. D. 67.

CHAPTER VIII.

SECTION I.—PRESUMPTION AGAINST INTENDING WHAT IS INCONVENIENT OR UNREASONABLE.

IN determining either what was the general object of the Legislature, or the meaning of its language in any particular passage, it is obvious that the intention which appears to be most agreeable to convenience, reason, justice, and legal principles, should, in all cases open to doubt, be presumed to be the true one. An argument drawn from an inconvenience, it has been said, is forcible in law (*a*); and no less force is due to any drawn from an absurdity or injustice. The treaty between Louis XII. and the Pope, which gave the King the right of appointing to "all bishoprics vacated by the death of bishops "in France," was, for instance, properly construed, not as giving him the right of appointing to a foreign bishopric whenever its incumbent happened to die in France, but, more consistently with good sense and convenience, as authorising him to fill the bishoprics of his own kingdom, when their holders died, whether at home or abroad (*b*). A statute which gives an appeal

(*a*) Co. Litt. 97a.

(*b*) Puff. L. N. b. 5, c. 12, s. 8.

to any person thinking himself aggrieved by any order, conviction, judgment, or determination of a justice, does not apply to a prosecutor complaining of an acquittal. If it did, the person acquitted would be liable to be twice vexed for the same cause. Besides, the prosecutor could not legitimately be considered as aggrieved (a). Where there is an appeal from a magistrate's decision, "when the sum adjudged to be "paid on conviction shall exceed two pounds," the question whether the penalty only, or the penalty plus the costs were intended, would be decided on similar general considerations of convenience and reason. It would be thought more likely that the Legislature intended to give an appeal only when the offence was of some gravity, and not merely where the costs (which would vary according to the distances to be travelled by the parties and their witnesses, the number of the latter, and similar accidental circumstances) happened to swell the amount above the fixed limit (b).

An Act regulating local rates, which gave an appeal against any rate to the Quarter Sessions, and provided, for enforcing its payment, that two justices might issue a distress warrant against the goods of the defaulter, if he did not, on being summoned, "prove to them that he was not chargeable with, or

(a) 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 50, s. 105; *R. v. London J.J.*, 25 Q. B. D. 357. (b) *R. v. Warwickshire*, 6 E. & B. 837.

“liable to pay such rate,” would not be construed as authorising the justices to enter upon any inquiry into the validity of the rate, if it was valid on its face; though, literally, the defaulter would unquestionably prove his non-liability, if he proved its invalidity. If the question of validity, which was left to the Quarter Sessions, was also open to the justices required to enforce the rate, they might decide against the validity of the rate after it had been adjudged valid by the Quarter Sessions (a); a conflict which could not readily be supposed to have been intended. It would be otherwise, indeed, if the rate bore invalidity on its face, by not showing that it was made in accordance with the statutory authority given for the purpose; for they could not be required to enforce what did not profess to be a valid demand made by competent authority (b).

An Act to provide protection against dogs, which empowered magistrates to make an order that any dog found to be dangerous should “be kept under proper control or destroyed,” would, on this principle, be construed as giving the magistrate the option of making an absolute order for the destruction of a

(a) *Birmingham v. Shaw*, 10 Q. B. 868; *Re Williams*, 2 E. & B. 84; *R. v. Kingston*, E. B. & E. 256; *R. v. Bradshaw*, 2 E. & E. 836; *R. v. Higginson*, 2 B. & S. 471; *Exp. May*, 2 B. & S. 426; *R. v. Linford*, 7 E. & B. 950; *R. v. Finnis*, 28 L. J. M. C. 201. See *Wake v. Sheffield*, 12 Q. B. D. 142.

(b) *R. v. Eastern Counties R. Co.*, 5 E. & B. 974. See *R. v. Croke*, 1 Cowp. 30.

dangerous dog ; not as requiring that his order should be in the alternative terms of the Act, which would place the option in the hands of the owner of the dog ; for this would be much less efficacious and convenient (*a*).

The 24 & 25 Vict. c. 98, which, after making it felony to engrave without authority plates of bank-notes purporting to be notes of the Bank of England or of Ireland, or of any other company, declared in another section that the enactment should not apply to Scotland, except where it was expressly so provided, was held to apply to the engraving of the notes of a Scotch bank ; the rational object and meaning of the excluding provision being, not that forgeries against Scotch banks might be committed in England with impunity, but that, when committed in Scotland, they should not fall within the Act (*b*).

Where an Act, after transferring all duties of paving and lighting from existing Commissioners to a Board of Works, provided that all contracts with the former should remain valid, that no action upon them against the Commissioners should abate, and that all liabilities under such contracts should be paid out of rates to be made by the new Board ; it was held, on the ground of its being the more convenient course, that an action on a contract made with the Commissioners might be

(*a*) *Pickering v. Marsh*, 43 1 C. C. 133. *Comp. Re*
L. J. M. C. 143. O'Loghlin, L. R. 6 Ch. 406.

(*b*) *R. v. Brackenridge*, L. R.

brought against the Board (*a*). The 20 & 21 Vict. c. 43, which authorises a party aggrieved by a decision of justices to apply within three days for a case, and directs that "at the time of the application," and before the case is delivered to him, he shall enter into recognizances to prosecute the appeal, was held substantially complied with if the recognizances were entered into within the three days, though not at the time of the application (*b*). It has been repeatedly held that when an Act gives an appeal to the "next" sessions, it means not necessarily the next which takes place in order of time, or an adjournment of it (*c*), but the next to which it is practicable with fair diligence to carry the appeal (*d*). It is obvious that a stricter construction would often have the effect of taking away the appeal which the Legislature intended to give. When an Act gave any person aggrieved (*e*)

(*a*) *Sinnott v. Whitechapel*, 3 C. B. N. S. 674.

(*b*) *Chapman v. Robinson*, 1 E. & E. 25.

(*c*) *R. v. Sussex*, 7 T. R. 107.

(*d*) *R. v. Yorkshire*, 1 Doug. 192; *R. v. Dorsetshire*, 15 East, 200; *R. v. Sussex*, 15 East, 206; *R. v. Essex*, 1 B. & A. 210; *R. v. Thackwell*, 4 B. & C. 62; *R. v. Devon*, 8 B. & C. 640; *R. v. Sevenoaks*, 7 Q. B. 136; *R. v. Sussex*, 4 B. & S.

966. See *R. v. Trafford*, 15 Q. B. 200; *R. v. Watts*, 7 A. & E. 461; *R. v. West Riding*, E. B. & E. 713.

(*e*) See *R. v. Middlesex*, 3 B. & Ad. 938; *Wood v. Heath*, 4 M. & Gr. 918; *R. v. Chichester*, 29 L. J. Q. B. 23; *Hollis v. Marshall*, 2 H. & N. 755; *Graves's Case*, L. R. 4 Q. B. 715; *Boyce v. Higgins*, 14 C. B. 1; *Exp. Learoyd*, 10 Ch. D. 3; *Exp. Thoday*, 2 Ch. D. 229, 797; *Verdin v. Wray*, 2 Q. B. D.

by an order of justices, four months "for making "his complaint to the Quarter Sessions," it was construed to mean, not that the complaint must be heard within that time, but that the appellant should have that time for notifying his intention to appeal; otherwise he might sometimes be limited to a few weeks, or, if no sessions were held within the four months, he would be deprived of his appeal altogether (α).

An Act which authorised the Quarter Sessions to give a successful appellant against a conviction, costs against the party appealed against, and directed that the notice of appeal should be served on the convicting justice, was construed as not making the latter a party to the appeal; for it was to be presumed that the Legislature did not intend so great an anomaly as rendering a judicial officer liable to costs for an act done *bonâ fide* in the discharge of his judicial functions (b). The respondent, in such a case, is the prosecutor before the magistrate; though this construction involves the hardship of making him liable to the costs of a proceeding of which he has had no notice, or perhaps even knowledge.

The statute which enacts that "a solicitor may make

608; comp. *Rochfort v. Atherley*, 1 Ex. D. 511; *Re Shaftoe's Charity*, 3 App. Cas. 872. (b) *R. v. Hants*, 1 B. & Ad. 654; *R. v. Smith*, 29 L. J. M. C. 216; *R. v. Purdey*, 5 B. & S.

(α) *R. v. Essex*, 34 L. J. M. 909. See *R. v. Bradlaugh*, 2 C. 41; *R. v. Middlesex*, 6 M. & Q. B. D. 569, 3 Q. B. D. S. 279. And see post, p. 607.

280.

“an agreement in writing with his client respecting “the amount and manner of his remuneration,” was held to require impliedly that the agreement should be signed by the client ; as otherwise it would be possible for a solicitor to place a document signed by himself only, and containing terms favourable to him, before his client, and then contend that the latter was bound by it (a).

Where one Act authorised the recovery of certain claims before justices of the peace, proceedings before whom are limited to six months, and another Act authorised their recovery, when not exceeding £20, in the County Courts, where the term of limitation was six years, it was held that suits for them in the latter Courts were limited to six months, to avoid imputing to the Legislature the anomalous intention of allowing six years for the recovery of small sums, while giving only six months for large ones (b). Similarly, on the ground (among others) that it would be unreasonable to presume that the Legislature intended to impose a more severe penalty on a person who without malice wilfully gathered uncultivated mushrooms than on one who unlawfully and maliciously destroyed cultivated roots or plants

(a) *Re Lewis*, 1 Q. B. D. 724. *Tottenham Board v. Rowell*, 1 Ex. D. 514. See also the judgment of the Exchequer Chamber in *Nicholson v. Ellis*, E. B. & E.

(b) 11 & 12 Vict. c. 63, s. 267, 283.
39, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 61, s. 24;

used for food, it was held that in view of s. 24 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 97, which imposed a penalty of one month's imprisonment or a fine of £1 in the latter case, s. 52 of the same Act, which makes it an offence punishable with two months' imprisonment or a fine of £5 to "wilfully or maliciously commit any damage, injury, or spoil to or upon any real or personal property whatsoever for which no punishment is hereinbefore provided," could not be regarded as applying to a case such as the former (a).

The Bankruptcy Acts which vested the future as well as the present property of the bankrupt in the assignee or trustee, imported the necessary exception, to save him from starving, of the remuneration which the bankrupt might earn by his labour after his bankruptcy, and the damages which he might recover for any personal injury (b); and while establishing the right of the assignee to future property as between himself and the bankrupt, did not affect the right of the latter as between himself and his debtor, unless the assignee interfered, to sue for a debt which accrued due after the vesting of the property in the assignee; and the provision contained in the Acts that the bankrupt should not have power to recover such debts, was similarly limited in effect (c). The Act

(a) *Gardner v. Mansbridge*, 19 Q. B. D. 217. 965; *Jackson v. Burnham*, 8 Ex. 173; *Jameson v. Brick Co.*,

(b) *Beckham v. Drake*, 2 H. L. 4 Q. B. D. 208; *Cohen v. Mitchell*, 25 Q. B. D. 262. But see 579; *Re Wilson*, 8 Ch. D. 364.

(c) *Herbert v. Sayer*, 5 Q. B. *Re Clark*, [1894] 2 Q. B. 393.

which imposes a penalty on the piracy of a dramatic work, or "any part thereof," would not be broken unless a material and substantial part was pirated. It is not to be supposed that the Legislature intended to punish the misappropriation of what was of no value (a).

A construction which facilitated the evasion of a statute would, on similar grounds of inconvenience, be avoided. Thus, an Act which forbade an innkeeper to suffer any gaming "in his house or premises," was construed as extending to gaming by himself and his personal friends in his private rooms in the licensed premises; for a construction which limited the prohibition to the guests in the public rooms would have opened the door to collusion and evasion (b).

And yet, a construction facilitating evasion, even to the extent of defrauding the revenue, may be justified and required by considerations of convenience, as in the case of Stamp Acts; where the question whether the document is sufficiently stamped depends solely on what appears on the face of the document, to the exclusion of all extrinsic evidence

(a) *Chatterton v. Cave*, 2 C. & E. 1; *Corbet v. Haigh*, 5 C. P. D. 42, 3 App. Cas. 483; *Pike v. Nicholas*, L. R. 5 Ch. 251; *Bradbury v. Hotten*, L. R. 8 Ex. 1; *Planché v. Braham*, 4 Bing. N. C. 7; *D'Almaine v. Boosey*, 1 Yo. & C. 301.

(b) *Patten v. Rhymer*, 3 E. & E. 1; *Bosley v. Davies*, 1 Id. 84.

to prove the contrary ; for, to admit evidence to invalidate it, would lead to the intolerable inconvenience of holding a collateral inquiry, to the interruption of the trial of the cause in which the paper was tendered (*a*).

Acts which impose a pecuniary penalty have sometimes given rise to a question, when there were two or more offenders, whether one joint or several separate penalties were intended ; and this, where the Act has left it open to doubt, has been said to depend on whether the offence was in its nature joint or several. When the offence is one in which every participator is justly punishable in proportion to the part which he took in it, the inference would obviously be that a separate penalty on each was intended. In the offence of assaulting and resisting a custom-house officer, one may resist, another molest, a third run away with the goods ; all are distinct acts, each a separate offence, and each offender would be liable for his own separate offence (*b*). So, under the Toleration Act, which enacts that if any person or persons maliciously disturb a congregation, such " person or persons " shall, on conviction of " the said offence," be liable to a penalty of £20 ; it was held that every person engaged in

(*a*) *Whistler v. Forster*, 14 Tottenham, [1894] 2 Q. B. C. B. N. S. 248 ; *Austin v.* 715). *Comp. Clarke v. Roche*, Bunyard, 6 B. & S. 687 ; *Gatty* 47 L. J. Q. B. 147.
v. Fry, 2 Ex. D. 265 (approved (*b*) *Per Lord Mansfield*, in *in Royal Bank of Scotland v. R. v. Clark*, 1 Cowp. 610.

T

such a disturbance would be liable to a separate penalty (*a*).

So, where two men were convicted of an assault and sentenced to pay one penalty, under the 9 Geo. IV. c. 31, the conviction was quashed ; because a penalty ought to have been imposed on each offender severally, the offence being in its nature several (*b*). And under the 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 32, s. 30, which enacts that if “any person” shall trespass in the daytime on land in search of game, “such persons” shall be liable to a penalty of £2, every offender is liable to a separate penalty (*c*).

But it has been said that where the offence is in its nature single, and is punished by a pecuniary penalty, only one penalty can be imposed on all the offenders jointly ; that if it is the offence, and not the offender, that is visited with punishment by the statute, only one penalty is incurred, however large may be the number of persons who incurred it. Thus, under the statute of Anne, which enacted that if any unqualified “person or persons” kept or used hounds for destroying game, “the person or persons” so offending should forfeit £5, it was held that to keep or use a greyhound for such a purpose was punishable by one penalty only, whether the dog was kept or used by one or by several persons.

(*a*) *R. v. Hube*, 5 T. R. E. 515.

542.

(*c*) *Mayhew v. Wardley*, 14

(*b*) *Morgan v. Brown*, 4 A. & C. B. N. S. 550.

Only one dog was kept, it was said, and only one penalty, falling on all the offenders jointly, was impossible (*a*). The decision has been perhaps better defended on the ground that the Act, in speaking of "persons" in the plural, and providing that for such "offence," in the singular, they should pay £5, and not £5 "each," one joint offence and penalty were contemplated (*b*). In an old case cited in support of this construction, it was held that the statute 1 & 2 Ph. & M. c. 12, which prohibited the impounding of a distress in a wrong place, "upon pain every person offending should forfeit to the party grieved for every such offence" a hundred shillings and treble damages, gave only one penalty against three persons (*c*). But although this decision is said to have been based on the ground that the offence was one only, and joint, the penalty was recoverable only by the party grieved, and was consequently to be regarded as a compensation to him, not as a punishment on the offenders (*d*). Viewed in this light, it is clear that only one penalty could be recovered; for the injury was the same, whether it was done by one or by several persons; and it could hardly have been intended that the pecuniary compensation

(*a*) *Hardyman v. Whitaker*,
2 East, 573n.; *R. v. Matthews*,
10 Mod. 26; *R. v. Bleasdale*, 4
T. R. 809.

(*b*) *Per Alderson B. in R. v.*
Dean, 12 M. & W. 42.

(*c*) *Partridge v. Naylor, Cro.*
Eliz. 480, cited in *R. v. Clark*, 2
Cowp. 610; *R. v. King*, 1 Salk.
182.

(*d*) See ex. gr. *Stevens v.*
Jeacocke, 11 Q. B. 731.

for a wrong should vary in amount with the number of persons concerned in doing it.

In referring to cases of this kind, Lord Mansfield observed that if partridges were netted by night, two or three or more men might draw the net, but still it constituted but one offence; and that killing a hare was but one offence, whether one killed it or twenty, and that it could not be killed more than once (a). But however pertinent such considerations might be in measuring the damage done to the owner of the game, they seem less applicable to the question of punishing, on public grounds, a breach of the law. The question whether the offence was joint or several evidently arose, not from the nature of the offence, but from the nature of the penalty. If the penalty had been corporal instead of pecuniary, the distinction between joint and several offences could hardly have occurred; for it would have been found difficult to apply the rule of one joint penalty to two offenders sentenced to five weeks' imprisonment or twenty-five lashes. It would seem that the question whether the penalty is to be understood as separate or joint, where the Act is not explicit, would be better governed by the consideration whether the penalty was intended as compensation for a private wrong, or as a punishment for an offence against public justice.

It is hardly necessary to add that all such considerations are immaterial where the language of the Act is

(a) In *R. v. Clarke*, 2 Cowp. 612.

not open to doubt. Thus, where it was enacted that "every person" who assisted in unshipping or concealing prohibited goods should forfeit treble their value or £100, at the election of the Commissioners of Customs, it was held that every person concerned in the offence was liable to a separate penalty (*a*); although undoubtedly the offence was as joint in its nature as in the case of the wrongful removal of the distress (*b*).

SECTION II.—PRESUMPTION AGAINST INTENDING INJUSTICE OR ABSURDITY.

A sense of the possible injustice of an interpretation ought not to induce judges to do violence to well-settled rules of construction, but it may properly lead to the selection of one rather than the other of two possible interpretations (*c*). Whenever the language of the Legislature admits of two constructions, and if construed in one way would lead to obvious injustice, the Courts act upon the view that such a result could not have been intended, unless the intention had been manifested in express words (*d*). Thus, where a bye-

(*a*) 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 53; *v. Skeen*, Bell, C. C. 97; and *R. v. Dean*, 12 M. & W. 39. *R. v. Land Tax Com.*, 2 E. &

(*b*) *Partridge v. Naylor*, Cro. B. 716; *per Keating J.* in *Boon* *v. Howard*, L. R. 9 C. P. 308;

(*c*) *Per Lord Herschell L.C.* *per Brett L.J.* in *R. v. Monck*, 2 Q. B. D. 555; *Smith v. G. W. R. Co.*, 3 App. Cas. 165;

(*d*) *Per Lord Campbell* in *R. per Lord Blackburn*, in *Roths*

law authorised the Poulterers' Company to fine "all" poulterers in London or "within seven miles round," who refused to be admitted into their company, it was held that, inasmuch as no poulter could legally belong to the company who was not also a freeman of the City, the bye-law was to be construed as limited to those poulterers who were also freemen; to avoid the injustice of punishing men for refusing to enter into a company to which they could not legally belong (*a*). So, in the sections 112 and 198 of the Bankrupt Act of 1849, which protected a bankrupt from arrest by his "creditors," this word was construed as limited to those creditors who had debts provable under the bankruptcy; for it would have been obviously unjust and was therefore presumably not intended, that his certificate should protect a bankrupt not only against those creditors who had, or might have proved under the bankruptcy, but against creditors whose claims were not barred by it (*b*). The provision that the Court of Bankruptcy should refuse a bankrupt his

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>v. Kirkaldy Commissioners</i>, 7 App. Cas. 702; <i>per</i> Lord Cairns in <i>Hill v. West India Dock Co.</i>, 9 App. Cas. 456; <i>Railton v. Wood</i>, 15 App. Cas. 363; <i>per</i> Brett M.R. in <i>Plumstead Board of Works v. Spackman</i>, 13 Q. B. D. 878; <i>per</i> Lord Esher M.R. in <i>Exp. Dunn</i>, 23 Q. B. D. 461.</p> <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Poulterers' Co. v. Phillips</i>,</p> | <p>6 Bing. N. C. 314; <i>R. v. Saddlers' Co.</i>, 32 L. J. Q. B. 337. And see <i>Exp. Corbett</i>, 14 Ch. D., <i>per</i> Brett M.R. at p. 243.</p> <p>(<i>b</i>) <i>Grace v. Bishop</i>, 11 Ex. 424; <i>Phillips v. Poland</i>, L. R. 1 C. P. 204; <i>Re Poland</i>, L. R. 1 Ch. 356; <i>Williams v. Rose</i>, L. R. 3 Ex. 5, <i>per</i> Bramwell B.</p> |
|--|--|

discharge "in all cases" where the debtor had committed an offence under the Debtors Act, 1869, applies only to cases connected with or arising out of the bankruptcy, the language used being so wide that if their full grammatical meaning were given to them, they would produce injustice so enormous that the Legislature could not have intended mere general words to lead to such a result (*a*). The enactment which protected magistrates in India from actions for any wrong or injury done by them in the exercise of the judicial office, was held to exempt them from liability only when acting *bonâ fide* in cases where they acted mistakenly without jurisdiction (*b*).

The Merchant Shipping Act of 1873, which enacts that if, "in any case of collision," it is proved that any of the regulations for preventing collisions had been infringed, the ship which infringed them shall be deemed in fault, unless the circumstances justified it, would apply only to cases where the infringement could have contributed to the collision, but not where it could not possibly have done so (*c*); just as an Act which imposes a penalty for piloting a ship down the Thames without license, is evidently limited to piloting on a voyage, and would not apply to a person in charge of a ship when merely shifting from one

(*a*) 50 & 51 Vict. c. 66, s. 2;
Re Brocklebank, 23 Q. B. D. 461.

(*b*) 21 Geo. III. c. 70; *Calder v. Halket*, 3 Moo. 28.

(*c*) 36 & 37 Vict. c. 85, s. 17.
The Englishman, 3 P. D. 18; *The Magnet*, L. R. 4 A. & E 417; *The Fanny Carvill*, 13 App. Cas. 455n.

wharf to another to unload the cargo (*a*). An imperative requirement that Assessment Sessions should be held so that all appeals should be determined before a certain date would not operate so unjustly as to deprive a person of the right of appeal where, through press of business at the sessions, his appeal could not be heard before that date (*b*). An Act which provided that no writ or process should issue for anything done under it but after a month's notice, would not apply to proceedings for an injunction; for if it did, the wrong might be irremediable, which could not be intended (*c*). Besides, the object of the provision was only to give the defendant time to make amends before he was sued (*d*). Nor would a similar enactment that "no action" should be brought in which a certain body of shipowners would be liable for any damage to any ship, without a month's notice, apply to proceedings in rem in the Admiralty Division, for if such a notice were necessary the proceedings might be futile, as the ship might sail away before the expiration of the month and avoid seizure (*e*). The 12 & 13 Vict. c. 92, s. 5, which requires "every "person" who impounds an animal, or causes it to be

(*a*) *R. v. Lambe*, 5 T. R. 76.

(*b*) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 67; *R. v. London J.J. & L.C.C.*, [1893] 2 Q. B. 476.

(*c*) *Atty.-Gen. v. Hackney Board*, L. R. 20 Eq. 626.

(*d*) *Flower v. Low Leyton*, 5 Ch. D. 347; and see *Foat v.*

Mayor of Margate, 11 Q. B. D. 299.

(*e*) 6 & 7 Will. IV. ch. c., s. 8; *The Longford*, 14 P. D. 34.

impounded or confined, to supply it with food, would not apply to the keeper of the pound (*a*).

The enactment in the Licensing Act of 1872, that "every person found drunk on licensed premises" should be liable to a penalty, though literally wide enough to include the publican who had got drunk anywhere and was found in that condition in his bed after the house was closed, would be construed, according to the manifest object of the Act, as confined to persons found on the premises while using it as a house for public resort (*b*).

A statute which enacts that a person who has been convicted by justices of an assault, and has suffered the punishment awarded for it, shall be released from all other proceedings "for the same cause," would not be construed as exempting him from prosecution for manslaughter, if the party assaulted afterwards died from the effects of the assault; such a construction would defeat the ends of justice (*c*). An Act which imposed a penalty on any sheriff or bailiff who carried a person arrested for debt to prison for twenty-four hours, though it might render the former liable for the act of the latter, his servant, as well as for his own,

(*a*) *Dargan v. Davies*, 2 Q. other illustrations in *Ancketill*
B. D. 118. *v. Baylis*, 52 L. J. Q. B. 104;

(*b*) 33 & 34 Vict. c. 29; *R. v. Kent J.J.*, 24 Q. B. D.
Lester v. Torrens, 2 Q. B. D. 181.

403. See *Warden v. Tye*, 2 (*c*) *R. v. Morris*, L. R. 1 C.
C. P. D. 74. *Comp. Patten v.* C. 90. See *Reed v. Nutt*, 59
Rhymer, sup., p. 272. See L. J. Q. B. 311

would not be construed to admit of his being sued, after the penalty had been recovered from the bailiff; for this would be to give the plaintiff a second penalty for the same act, after he had been compensated by the first; and would, indeed, make the bailiff liable to pay twice, as he would be bound by the usual bond to indemnify the sheriff (*a*).

The same argument applies where the consequence of adopting one of two interpretations would be to lead to an absurdity. Thus the 3rd section of the Newspaper Libel and Registration Act, 1881, which enacted that no criminal prosecution shall be commenced against a newspaper for libel without the fiat of the Director of Public Prosecutions, does not apply to a criminal information; for to hold otherwise would lead to the absurd and scandalous result that that officer, who was to act under the superintendence of the Attorney-General, might overrule the latter, and also the Queen's Bench Division, in the exercise of their power to give leave to file such information (*b*). The provision of the Public Health Act, 1875, s. 54, that where a local authority "supply water" within their district, they shall have certain powers as to carrying mains within and without that district, is not to be construed in its literal sense so as to involve the absurdity of requiring that the authority must

(*a*) *Peshall v. Layton*, 2 T. R. 712. See *Wright v. London Omnibus Co.*, 2 Q. B. D. 271. (*b*) 44 & 45 Vict. c. 60; *Yates v. R.*, 14 Q. B. D. 648.

have begun actually to supply some water before it can take advantage of the powers conferred, but is to be understood as conferring those powers upon the local authority as soon as it undertakes to supply water under the provisions of the Act (a). Similarly, a sewer made by a landowner for the sole purpose of draining houses erected by him on his own land, is not by reason of its enhancing the value of the houses "made for his own profit," within the meaning of the exception in s. 13 of the Public Health Act, 1875, so as not to vest in and be under the control of the local authority. It would be absurd to suppose that it was intended that the operation of s. 13, the whole object of which is to vest sewers in the local authority, should be thus practically reduced to a nullity (b).

An Act (5 & 6 Vict. c. 39, s. 6) which protected a fraudulent agent from conviction, if he "disclosed" his offence on oath, in any examination in bankruptcy, was held not to include a confession made there after commitment by a magistrate, and which was in substance only a repetition of the facts proved before the latter; on the ground that it would have been absurd and mischievous to enable a man to provide an indemnity for himself, by simply making a statement of facts already known and provable aliunde, and not in

(a) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55; *Ferrand v. Hallas Land Co.*,
Jones v. Conway Water Supply, [1893] 2 Q. B. 135. Comp.
[1893] 2 Ch. 603. *Minehead Local Bd. v. Luttrell*,

(b) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55; [1894] 2 Ch. 178.

any way advancing either civil or criminal justice by the alleged "disclosure" (a).

Although there is no positive rule of law against a retrospective rate (b), enactments which authorise the imposition of rates and similar burdens on the inhabitants of a locality have been repeatedly held not to authorise, without express words, a retrospective charge; on the ground of the injustice of throwing on one set of persons a burden which ought to have been borne by another at a former period (c). And where the Act makes the occupier rateable at what a tenant from year to year would give for it, it would be understood, where the property was subject by law to restrictions which prevented the occupier from obtaining the full value, that the hypothetical tenant was similarly subject to them (d).

An Act which prohibits the negligent use of furnaces in such a manner as not to make them con-

(a) *R. v. Skeen*, Bell, C. C. 97. So held by nine judges against five. See *Lewes v. Barnett*, 6 Ch. D. 252.

(b) See *Harrison v. Stickney*, 2 H. L. 108; *R. v. Carpenter*, 6 A. & E. 794; *R. v. Read*, 13 Q. B. 524; *Jones v. Johnson*, 7 Ex. 452; *R. v. Maidenhead*, 9 Q. B. D. 494; *Caistor v. N. Kelsey*, 59 L. J. M. C. 102.

(c) *Tawny's Case*, 2 Salk. 531; *Newton v. Young*, 1 B. & P. N. R. 187; *R. v. Maulden*, 8 B. & C. 78; *R. v. Dursley*, 5 A. & E. 10; *Waddington v. London Union*, 28 L. J. M. C. 113; *R. v. Stretfield*, 32 L. J. M. C. 236; *Bradford Union v. Wilts*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 604; *R. v. All Saints, Wigan*, 1 App. Cas. 611.

(d) *Worcester v. Droitwich*, 2 Ex. D. 49.

sume smoke "as far as possible," means only so far as the smoke can be consumed consistently with the due carrying on of the business for which the furnace is used, and not as far as it is physically possible to consume it, without regard to the detriment which the business carried on would suffer; the Act not having expressed any intention to interfere with it (a). Where a sewer in a street (not being a highway repairable by the inhabitants at large) has become vested in an urban authority under s. 13 of the Public Health Act, 1875, the powers of the authority under s. 150 of that Act, where such street is not sewered to their satisfaction, to require the frontagers to sewer it, can be exercised by the authority once only, and must be exercised within a reasonable time after the sewer has become vested in them. Any other construction would make the Act unjust and unreasonable (b). The Carriers Act (11 Geo. IV. & 1 Will. IV. c. 68), which exempts carriers from responsibility for the loss of certain articles worth more than £10, unless their nature and value are declared, but enacts also that the Act shall not affect any special contract of carriage, was construed, not literally as making the Act inapplicable whenever any special contract was made, but only as not affecting any special contract inconsistent with the exemp-

(a) *Cooper v. Woolley*, L. R. 2 Ex. 88. *Bonella v. Twickenham* Loc. Bd., 20 Q. B. D. 63.

(b) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55;

tion provided by the Act (*a*). The ordinary stipulation in a bill of lading, excepting liability for breakage, leakage and damage, would be similarly limited in construction, as not extending to any such injury caused by the shipowner or his servants (*b*). So the clause in a bill of lading of goods from Malaga to Liverpool authorising the ship to call at "any port or ports, in any rotation, in the Mediterranean, Levant, Black Sea, or Adriatic, or on the coasts of Africa, Spain, Portugal, France, Great Britain, and Ireland, for any purpose," would be limited to ports in geographical order which were substantially on the course of the voyage (*c*).

It is to be borne in mind that the injustice and hardship which the Legislature is presumed not to intend is not merely such as may occur in individual and exceptional cases only. Laws are made *ad ea quæ frequentius accidunt* (*d*); and individual hardship not unfrequently results from enactments of general advantage. The argument of hardship has been said to be always a dangerous one to listen to (*e*). It is apt to introduce bad law (*f*); and has occasionally led to

(*a*) *Baxendale v. The G. E. R. Co.*, L. R. 4 Q. B. 244.

(*b*) *Phillips v. Clark*, 2 C. B. N. S. 156; *Czech v. Gen. Steam Nav. Co.*, L. R. 3 C. P. 14.

(*c*) *Margetson v. Glyn*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 337.

(*d*) Dig. 1. 9. 3-10.

(*e*) *Per Cur. in Munro v. Butt*, 8 E. & B. 754.

(*f*) *Per Rolfe B. in Winterbottom v. Wright*, 10 M. & W. 116; *Brand v. Hammersmith R. Co.*, L. R. 2 Q. B. 241; *Adams v. Graham*, 33 L. J. Q. B. 71.

the erroneous interpretation of statutes (*a*). Courts ought not to be influenced or governed by any notions of hardship (*b*). They must look at hardships in the face rather than break down the rules of law (*c*); and if, in all cases of ordinary occurrence, the law, in its natural construction, is not inconsistent, or unreasonable, or unjust, that construction is not to be departed from merely because it may operate with hardship or injustice in some particular case (*d*).

SECTION III.—CONSTRUCTION AGAINST IMPAIRING OBLIGATIONS, OR PERMITTING ADVANTAGE FROM ONE'S OWN WRONG.

On the general principle of avoiding injustice and absurdity, any construction would, if possible, be rejected, unless the policy and object of the Act required it, which enabled a person to defeat or

(*a*) *Comp. ex. gr. Perry v. Berkeley Peerage*, 4 Camp. 419; *Skinner*, 2 M. & W. 471, with *and in Jesson v. Wright*, 2 R. v. Mill, 10 C. B. 379; and *Bligh*, 55; *per Jessel M.R. in Ford v. Kettle*, 9 Q. B. D. 139; *Welch v. Nash*, 8 East, 394, and *Kirk v. Todd*, 21 Ch. D. 484, with *R. v. Phillips*, L. R. 1 Q. B. 648. See *Re Palmer's Trade Mark*, 21 Ch. D. 47.

(*b*) *Per Lord Abinger in Rhodes v. Smethurst*, 4 M. & W. 63; *per Lord Esher M.R. in Re Perkins*, 24 Q. B. D. 618.

(*c*) *Per Lord Eldon in the* (d) *See Co. Litt. 97b, 152b; per Parke B. in Miller v. Salomons*, 21 L. J. Ex. 192, and *Williams v. Roberts*, 7 Ex. 628; *per Lord Blackburn in Young v. Mayor of Leamington*, 8 App. Cas. 527.

impair the obligation of his contract by his own act, or otherwise to profit by his own wrong. Thus, an Act which authorised justices to discharge an apprentice under certain circumstances, from his indenture, "on the master's appearance" before them, would justify a discharge in his wilful absence. The Act, it was observed, must have a reasonable construction, so as not to permit the master to take advantage of his own obstinacy. It would be very hard that, supposing the master was profligate and ran away, the apprentice should never be discharged (*a*). For similar reasons, an Act (30 & 31 Vict. c. 84) which authorised a justice to summon a parent "to appear with his child" before him, for breach of the Vaccination Act, and "upon his appearance," to order the vaccination of the child, if he should find that it had not already undergone that operation, was held to authorise such an order without the appearance of the child, when the parent refused to produce it. A literal construction, making the production of the child a condition precedent to the making of the order, would have involved the supposition that the Legislature had intended to allow the parent to defeat its object by disobeying the summons which it had ordered (*b*). So a parent who sent his child to the

(*a*) *Ditton's Case*, 2 Salk. 490. *Cinque Ports*, 17 Q. B. D. 191.
See *Gordon v. G. W. R.*, 8 Q. Comp. *Barnardo v. Ford*, [1892]
B. D. 44. A. C. 326 ; and see *supra*, pp. 13,

(*b*) *Dutton v. Atkins*, L. R. 14.
6 Q. B. 673 ; *R. v. Justice of*

Board School without also sending the school fees did not "cause the child to attend the school" within the meaning of the Education Act, 1870, s. 74 (a). A trustee in bankruptcy who has received a sum, would be liable to arrest under the provision of the Debtors Act of 1869, which makes a trustee liable to imprisonment for disobeying an order to pay a sum "in his possession or his control," though in fact he had spent it all (b). The provision of the Real Property Limitation Act, 1874, that no action should be brought to recover certain sums of money but within twelve years next after "a present right to receive the same" shall have accrued to some person capable of giving a discharge for it, must be taken in its ordinary sense, and is not to be interpreted as referring to "a present right to sue for the same," which may be contingent on the doing of some act by the person entitled to receive the sum, and may be delayed by him accordingly (c).

Although the 9 Anne, c. 14, enacted that bills and notes, founded on the consideration of money lost at play, should be "utterly frustrate, void, and of none effect, to all intents and purposes," its operation was

- (a) 33 & 34 Vict. c. 75; 6 Ch. 152. See *Lewes v. London School Board v. Wright*, 12 Q. B. D. 578; and see *Id.* (c) 37 & 38 Vict. c. 57, s. 8; *Hornsey Loc. Bd. v. Monarch Investment Bldg. Socy.*, 24 Q. B. D. 1.
- (b) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, s. 4; *Middleton v. Chichester, L. R.*

confined to preventing the drawer (or any person claiming under him (a)) from recovering from the loser; but it left the instrument unaffected in the hands of an innocent indorsee for value suing the drawer (b). The statute was construed as if the words were voidable as against certain persons only, but were valid as regards others.

So, where an Act provided that if the purchaser at an auction refused to pay the auction duty, when this was made a condition of sale, his bidding should be "null and void to all intents and purposes," it was held that the object of the enactment was completely attained by making the bidding void only at the option of the seller; thus avoiding the injustice and impolicy of enabling a man to escape from the obligation of his contract by his own wrongful act, which a literal construction would have involved (c).

An enactment that a company should not issue any share, that no share should vest until one-fifth of its amount was paid up, and that the shareholder who

(a) *Bowyer v. Bampton*, 2 Stra. 1155. at the option of the lessor. The literal construction would enable

(b) *Edwards v. Dick*, 4 B. & Ald. 212. a lessee to get rid of an onerous lease by wilfully breaking a

(c) *Malins v. Freeman*, 4 Bing. N. C. 395. So, the usual stipulation in a lease that if any covenant is broken by the lessee, the lease shall be void, is construed as voidable only at the option of the lessor. See *Doe v. Bancks*, 4 B. & Ald. 401; *Rede v. Farr*, 6 M. & S. 121; and *per Lord Cairns in Magdalen Hospital v. Knotts*, 4 App. 332.

had not paid up one-fifth should have no right of property in the shares allotted to him, or capacity to transfer them, was considered as limited to protection to the public. To construe it as applying also to the benefit of the shareholder, would have been to absolve him from liability to pay up calls until he had paid the requisite proportion ; or, in other words, to enable him to profit by his own default ; a consequence too unjust and unreasonable to have been intended (*a*).

On similar grounds, probably, enactments which avoid or abridge the effect of conveyances, contracts, and instruments, have generally received a construction more compatible with the obvious object and policy of the Legislature than with the natural meaning of the language. Thus, the Act of Will. III., which declared void all conveyances of property "in order to multiply "voices," does not apply where the vendor is not privy to the illegal object (*b*).

Though the Act of 13 Eliz. c. 10, made "utterly "void and of none effect, to all intents, constructions, and purposes," all leases by ecclesiastical persons and bodies, other than for twenty-one years or three lives, the prohibited leases have always been held valid as against the lessor, when a corporation sole, and even

(*a*) *East Gloucestershire R. & J. 80, sup., p. 13.*
Co. v. Bartholomew, L. R. 3 (b) 7 & 8 Will. III. c. 25, s.
Ex. 15. Comp., however, R. 7 ; Marshall v. Bown, 7 M. &
v. Staffordshire, 7 East, 549, Gr. 188; Hoyland v. Bremner,
and Exp. Parbury, 3 De G. F. 2 C. B. 84; sup., 125.

when a corporation aggregate with a head, during the life of its head (*a*); probably on the principle of a personal estoppel by reason of a personal interest in the head of the corporation (*b*). When it has no head, indeed, the Act receives necessarily its primary and natural meaning; and the lease is void *ab initio* (*c*). If it did not make the lease altogether bad, the latter would be altogether good (*d*); which would be contrary to every possible construction of the Act.

An Act which required that indentures for binding parish apprentices should be for the term of seven years at least, declaring that otherwise they should be "void to all intents and purposes, and not available" "in any court or place for any purpose whatever," was held, nevertheless, to make an indenture for a shorter term only voidable at the option of the master or apprentice; or at all events to leave it so far valid that service under it sufficed to gain a settlement (*e*). Though the Infants Relief Act, 1874, makes all contracts for the supply to an infant of goods which are

(*a*) *Bishop of Salisbury's Case*, 10 Rep. 60b. Co. Litt. 45a; *Lincoln College Case*, 3 Rep. 60a; *Bac. Ab. Leases (H.)* See also *Roberts v. Davey*, 4 B. & Ad. 664; *Davenport v. R.*, 3 App. Cas. 115.

(*b*) *Per Lord Cairns*, 4 App. 333.

(*c*) *Magdalen Hosp. v. Knotts*,

4 App. Cas. 324.

(*d*) *Per Cresswell J. in Young v. Billiter*, 25 L. J. Q. B. 178.

(*e*) 5 Eliz. c. 4; *R. v. St. Nicholas*, 2 Stra. 1066, Ca. Temp. Hardw. 323; *Gray v. Cookson*, 16 East, 13; *R. v. St. Gregory*, 2 A. & E. 107; *Oakes v. Turquand*, L. R. 2 H. L. 325; *Burgess's Case*, 15 Ch. D. 507.

not necessities absolutely void, the infant cannot recover the money he has paid for them if he has used or consumed them (*a*).

The Act of 3 Hen. VII. c. 4, which declared that gifts of goods and chattels in trust for the donor and in fraud of his creditors should be "void and of none effect," was early held to be so only as to those who were prejudiced by the gift, but not as between the parties (*b*). And the 13 Eliz. c. 5, would not include a conveyance for valuable consideration, though made with intent to defeat an execution creditor (*c*). Even as regards the persons prejudiced, the transaction is not void ipso facto, but only voidable at their option (*d*). In s. 47 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, which enacted that voluntary settlements made by a person who became bankrupt within two years after should be void as against the trustee in bankruptcy, "void" has been held to mean "voidable," so that the title of a purchaser from the donee for valuable consideration in good faith before avoidance, could not afterwards be defeated by the trustee (*e*). The 137th section of the Bankrupt Act of 1849, which

(*a*) 37 & 38 Vict. c. 62, s. 1; 892; *Darvill v. Terry*, 6 H. & Valentini v. Canali, 24 Q. B. D. N. 807.

166.

(*d*) See the cases in *Young*

(*b*) *Ridler v. Punter*, Cro. Eliz. 291; *Bessey v. Windham*, 6 Q. B. 166. See *Phillpotts v. Brall*, [1893] 2 Q. B. 377.

(*c*) *Wood v. Dixie*, 7 Q. B.

enacted that a judge's order to enter up judgment, made against a trader with his consent, should be "null and void to all intents and purposes whatever," if not filed as required by the Act, was construed as making the judgment void only as against his assignees, but not as against himself. A literal construction would have enabled the trader to treat his creditor who took out execution on the judgment to which he had consented, as a trespasser (a). So the non-compliance with the requirement of s. 27 of the Debtors Act, 1869, that a judge's order for judgment made by consent of the defendant in a personal action shall be filed in the manner prescribed within twenty-one days after the making thereof, "otherwise the order and any judgment signed or entered up thereon, and any execution issued or taken out on such judgment shall be void," only renders such an order and judgment void as against the creditors of such defendant, and not as against himself (b). On the same ground, a section which declared a warrant of attorney under certain circumstances "void to all intents and purposes," was held to mean only that it was void against the assignees in bankruptcy of the person who had given it; although in another section the warrant was declared to be

(a) *Bryan v. Child*, 1 L. M. Gowan v. Wright, 18 Q. B. D. & P. 429; *Green v. Gray*, 1 201; *Crawshaw v. Harrison*, Dowl. 350. [1894] 1 Q. B. 79.

(b) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 62;

“void against the assignees” if not filed. The difference in the language of the two sections was considered by the majority of the Court as insufficient to establish any substantial difference of intention, when the consequence would be to enable a person to defeat his own act (*a*).

Though the Sunday Act has the effect of avoiding contracts made on Sunday by and with tradesmen and other classes of persons, in the course of their ordinary calling, the invalidity affects only those persons who, when contracting with them, knew their calling; but those who dealt with them in ignorance of it would be entitled to sue on the contract (*b*).

In all these cases the intention of the Legislature was considered as completely carried out by the restricted scope given to its enactments. But where, having regard to the general policy of the Act as well as to the language and the structure of the sentence, it would not have that effect, the words abridging or avoiding the effect of instruments, contracts, and dealings would receive their primary and natural meaning. Thus, in the Bills of Sale Act of 1854, assignments not registered were null and void in the full and natural sense of the words (*c*); and in the later Act

- | | |
|--|--|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Morris v. Mellin</i> , 6 B. & C. 446; | <i>B. & C. 232.</i> |
| <i>Bennett v. Daniel</i> , 10 B. & C. 500. See <i>Davis v. Bryant</i> , 6 B. & C. 651. | (<i>c</i>) See <i>ex. gr. Richards v. James</i> , L. R. 2 Q. B. 285. <i>Comp. Exp. Blaiberg</i> , 23 Ch. D. 254. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Bloxome v. Williams</i> , 3 | |

of 1882, the provision of s. 9, which voids a bill of sale unless made in accordance with the form in the schedule, has been held to void it *in toto*, and not merely as regards the personal chattels comprised in it; so that a covenant contained in it for the payment by the grantee of the principal and interest thereby secured is rendered inoperative (a). Similarly in the case of contracts for the sale of a ship, and marine insurances (b) not in conformity with the Ship Registry Act of 8 & 9 Vict. (c). It was held that the owner of a vessel who pledged the ship's certificate of registry for good consideration, might redemand the certificate, and sue the pledgee if he did not return it, though thus defeating his own act; the 50th section of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854 and the plain policy of the law expressly forbidding all dealings with the certificate except for the purposes of navigation (d). So, in the case cited in an earlier page, where an Act recited the mischiefs occasioned by binding parish apprentices without the sanction of justices, and enacted that no indenture of such apprenticeships should be valid unless approved by two justices, under their hands and seals; it was held that an indenture, approved under hand but not under seal, was abso-

(a) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 43; 10 Ch. 542.

Davies v. Rees, 17 Q. B. D. (c) Duncan v. Tindall, 13 408. But see *Re Burdett*, 20 C. B. 258.

Q. B. D. 310. (d) *Wiley v. Crawford*, 1 B.

(b) *Re Arthur Assoc.*, L. R. & S. 253.

lutely void (a). The same effect was given, in an action by the trustees against their lessee for rent which had been made payable to them, to an Act which provided that every lease of turnpike tolls should make the rent payable to the treasurer, in default of which it should be "null and void" (b).

Where a statute not only declares a contract void, but imposes a penalty for making it, it is not voidable merely (c). The penalty makes it illegal. In general, however, it would seem that where the enactment has relation only to the benefit of particular persons, the word "void" would be understood as "voidable" only, at the election of the persons for whose protection the enactment was made, and who are capable of protecting themselves; but that when it relates to persons not capable of protecting themselves, or when it has some object of public policy in view which requires the strict construction, the word receives its natural full force and effect (d).

(a) *R. v. Stoke Damerell*, 7 B. & C. 563, sup., p. 10. See also *R. v. Bawbergh*, 2 B. & C. 222.

(b) *Pearse v. Morrice*, 2 A. & E. 84. Comp. *Hodson v. Sharpe*, 10 East, 350.

(c) *Gye v. Felton*, 4 Taunt. 876.

(d) See *per* Bayley J. in *R. v. Hipswell*, 8 B. & C. 471. See also *Betham v. Gregg*, 10 Bing. 352, and *Storie v. Winchester*, 17 C. B. 653.

SECTION IV.—RETROSPECTIVE OPERATION.—1. AS REGARDS VESTED RIGHTS.—2. AS REGARDS PROCEDURE.

Upon the presumption that the Legislature does not intend what is unjust rests the leaning against giving certain statutes a retrospective operation (*a*). *Nova constitutio futuris formam imponere debet, non præteritis*. They are construed as operating only on cases or facts which come into existence after the statutes were passed (*b*), unless a retrospective effect be clearly intended. It is a fundamental rule of English law that no statute shall be construed so as to have a retrospective operation, unless its language is such as plainly to require such a construction; and the same rule involves another and subordinate rule to the effect that a statute is not to be construed so as to have a greater retrospective operation than its language renders necessary (*c*). Even in construing a section which is to a certain extent retrospective, the maxim ought to be borne in mind as applicable whenever the line is reached at which the words of the section cease to be plain (*d*).

For it is to be observed that the retrospective effect of a statute may be partial in its operation. Thus it

(*a*) 2 Inst. 292.

4 H. & N. 76; *Vansittart v.*

(*b*) *Per* Erle C.J. in *Midland*

Taylor, 4 E. & B. 910.

R. Co. v. Pye, 10 C. B. N. S.

(*c*) *Per* Lindley L.J. in *Lauri v. Renard*, [1892] 3 Ch. 421.

191; *per* Cockburn C.J., in *R.*

v. Ipswich, 2 Q. B. D. 269; *per*

(*d*) *Per* Bowen L.J. in *Reid*

Pollock C.B. in *Young v. Hughes*,

v. Reid, 31 Ch. D. 409.

has been said that s. 35 of the Divided Parishes Act, 1876, which contains a code of transmitted status in relation to settlement, is to be considered as fully retrospective for all purposes, except only as regards adjudications made before the commencement of the Act; so that for the purpose of determining the settlement of children born after 1876, it may be that their father's settlement is governed by the section, even though his settlement, for the purposes of his own removal, is not affected by it (*a*).

It is chiefly where the enactment would prejudicially affect vested rights, or the legal character of past transactions, or impair contracts, that the rule in question prevails. Every statute, it has been said, which takes away or impairs vested rights acquired under existing laws, or creates a new obligation, or imposes a new duty, or attaches a new disability in respect of transactions or considerations already past, must be presumed, out of respect to the Legislature (*b*), to be intended not to have a retrospective operation (*c*). Thus, the provision of

(*a*) 39 & 40 Vict. c. 61, s. 35; *Bath v. Berwick*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 731. Chase C.J. in *Calder v. Bull*, 3 Dallas, 390, cited by Willes J. in *Phillips v. Eyre*, L. R. 6 Q.

(*b*) *Per* Chancellor Kent in *Dash v. Van Kleeck*, 7 Johnson, 502, etc. B. 1, where the distinction between retrospective and *ex post facto* legislation is indicated.

(*c*) *Per* Story J. in *Soc. for Propag. of Gosp. v. Wheeler*, 2 Gallison, 139; and see *per* See also *per* Lopes L.J. in *Re Pulborough School Board Election*, [1894] 1 Q. B. 737.

the Statute of Frauds, that no action should be brought to charge any person on any agreement made in consideration of marriage, unless the agreement were in writing, was held not to apply to an agreement which had been made before the Act was passed (*a*). The Mortmain Act, in the same way, was held not to apply to a devise made before it was enacted (*b*). And the Apportionment Act of 1870, which enacts that after the passing of the Act, rents are to be considered as accruing from day to day, like interest, and to be apportionable in respect of time accordingly, would seem not to apply to a will made before the Act, though the testator died after it came into operation (*c*). The testator was presumed to have in view the state of the law when he made his will (*d*). The contrary presumption that the testator who left his will unaltered after the Act was passed, intended that it should operate on the will (*e*), would imply that he knew that the law had been changed. So, it was held that the Act of 8 & 9 Vict. c. 109, which made all wagers void, and enacted that no action should be brought or maintained for a wager, applied only to

(*a*) *Gilmore v. Shuter*, 2 Lev. 227; 2 Mod. 310; *Ash v. Abdy*, 3 Swanst. 664. See also *Doe v. Page*, 5 Q. B. 767; *Doe v. Bold*, 11 Q. B. 127.

(*b*) *Atty.-Gen. v. Lloyd*, 3 Atk. 551; *Ashburnham v. Bradshaw*, 2 Atk. 36.

(*c*) *Jones v. Ogle*, L. R. 8 Ch. 192.

(*d*) *Re March*, 27 Ch. D. 166. But see *Re Bridger*, [1894] 1 Ch. 297.

(*e*) *Per Jessel M.R. in Hasluck v. Pedley*, 19 Eq. 271.

wagers made after the Act was passed (a); the Gaming Act, 1892, which prevents a betting agent from recovering from his employer sums paid for bets, was held not to prevent such recovery where the sums had been paid before the passing of the Act (b); and the Kidnapping Act of 1872, which made it unlawful for a vessel to carry native labourers of the Pacific Islands without a license, did not apply to a voyage begun before the Act was passed (c). Where one of the ingredients of an offence had been committed after the passing of the Act which created the offence, but before the Act came into operation, the fact that the other ingredients were committed after did not make the offence one within the Act (d). The Bills of Sale Act of 1882, which made void bills of sale not registered within seven days of their execution, was held not to apply to instruments executed before the Act came into operation. Compliance, it is evident, would have been impossible where the deed had been executed more than seven days before the Act passed (e). The 20 Vict. c. 19, which declared that extra-parochial places should, for poor-law and other

(a) *Moon v. Durden*, 2 Ex. 22; *Pettamberdass v. Thackoorseydass*, 7 Moo. P. C. 239. See *Exp. White*, 33 L. J. Bey. 22.

(b) 55 & 56 Vict. c. 9; *Knight v. Lee*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 41.

(c) 36 & 37 Vict. c. 19; *Burns v. Nowell*, 5 Q. B. D. 444.

(d) 53 & 54 Vict. c. 71, s. 26; *R. v. Griffiths*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 145.

(e) *Hickson v. Darlow*, 23 Ch. D. 690.

purposes, he deemed parishes, was held not retrospective, so as to confer the status of irremovability on a pauper who had resided in such a place for five years before the Act (*a*).

The enactments of the Patents Act, 1883, have been held not to affect any patent granted before the commencement of the Act (*b*); and it has been decided that the International Copyright Act, 1886, is not to be construed so as to revive or recreate a right which had expired before it passed, and to take away from the public the right which they had acquired under previous legislation (*c*). The Married Women's Property Act, 1882, did not entitle a plaintiff, who was suing a married woman upon a promissory note made by her before the passing of the Act, to have judgment against her in such terms as to be available against separate property to which she became entitled after the date of the note (*d*). Nor did it operate upon property falling into the possession of a married woman after the passing of the Act to which she had acquired a title before, so as

(*a*) *R. v. St. Sepulchre*, 28 L. J. M. C. 187; and see *R. v. Ipswich Union*, 2 Q. B. D. 269; *Sunderland v. Sussex*, 8 Q. B. D. 993; *Barton Regis v. Liverpool*, 3 Q. B. D. 295; *Gardner v. Lucas*, 3 App. Cas. 582.
(*b*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 57; *Re Brandon*, 9 App. Cas. 589.

(*c*) 49 & 50 Vict. c. 33, s. 6; *Lauri v. Renard*, [1892] 3 Ch. 402.

(*d*) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 75, s. 1, sub-s. 4; *Turnbull v. Forman*, 15 Q. B. D. 234; as to cases of mere procedure under the Act, see post, p. 315.

to make it her separate estate (*a*). Even a statute which confers a benefit, such as abolishing a tax, would not be construed retrospectively, to relieve the persons already subject to the burden before it was abolished. An Act passed in August, providing that on all goods captured from the enemy, and made prize of war, a deduction of one-third of the ordinary duties should be made, did not apply where the prize with her cargo, though condemned in September, had been brought into port in June, when certain duties accrued due (*b*).

The Bankrupt Act of 1849, which made a deed of arrangement "now or hereafter" entered into by a trader with six-sevenths of his creditors binding on the non-executing creditors, at the expiration of three months after they "should have had" notice, was held to apply only to deeds executed after the passing of the Act (*c*). To apply such an enactment to past transactions, even though the property had been completely distributed among the creditors who had signed, would have been so unjust, that it was justifiable to seek any means of getting rid of the apparent effect of the word "now," which was accordingly

(*a*) *Reid v. Reid*, 31 Ch. D. 402. *Noble v. Gadban*, 5 H. L. 504 ;

(*b*) *Prince v. U. S.*, 2 Gallison, 204. *Re Phoenix Bessemer Co.*, 45 L. J. Ch. 11. See also *Reed v.*

(*c*) 12 & 13 Vict. c. 106 ; *Wiggins*, 13 C. B. N. S. 220. *Wagh v. Middleton*, 8 Ex. 352 ; *Comp. Elston v. Braddick*, 2 Cr. Marsh *v. Higgins*, 9 C. B. 551 ; & M. 435 ; *Exp. Dawson*, L. Larpent *v. Bibby*, 5 H. L. 481 ; R. 19 Eq. 433.

understood as restricted to arrangements not completed but yet binding in equity at the time when the Act was passed. So, a non-trader was held not liable to adjudication as a bankrupt in respect of a debt contracted before the enactment, which first made non-traders liable to the bankruptcy laws (*a*). The provision of s. 32 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, that "where a debtor is adjudged bankrupt" he shall be subject to certain disqualifications, has been held to disqualify those persons only who were made bankrupt after the passing of the Act (*b*). So, it was held that the heavier legacy duty imposed on annuities by the Succession Act of 1853, did not affect an annuity left by a testator who died before that Act came into operation; though the payment was not made till after it was in force (*c*). Although the Divorce Act, 20 & 21 Vict. c. 85, provided that when a magistrate's order for protecting a deserted married woman's property against her husband was made, the woman should be, and "be deemed to have been "during the desertion," capable of suing and being sued, such an order would not enable her to maintain an action which she had begun before the order, but after the desertion (*d*). She had no right to sue

(*a*) *Williams v. Harding*, L. R. 1 H. L. 9.

(*c*) *Re Earl Cornwallis*, 11 Ex. 580.

(*b*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 52; *Re Pulborough School Board Election*, [1894] 1 Q. B. 725.

(*d*) *The Midland R. Co. v. Pye*, 10 C. B. N. S. 179.

before the order was obtained, and the Act did not intend to cast a liability on the defendants that they were not already under, and take away their defence from them, by such an order (a).

The 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 83, s. 1, which empowered a patentee, with the leave of the Attorney-General, to enrol a disclaimer of any part of his invention, and declared that such disclaimer should be deemed and taken to be part of his patent and specification, was construed by the Court of Exchequer as enacting that the disclaimer should be so taken "from thenceforth"; the interpolation being deemed justifiable to avoid the apparent injustice of giving a retrospective effect to the disclaimer, and making a man a trespasser by relation (b). But this construction was rejected by the Common Pleas, on the ground that the enactment really worked no injustice in operating retrospectively (c).

The 1st section of the Mercantile Law Amendment Act of 1856, which provides that no fi. fa. shall prejudice the title to goods, of a bonâ fide purchaser for value, before actual seizure under the writ, was held not to apply where the writ had been delivered to the sheriff before the Act was passed. As the execution creditor had the goods already bound by the delivery of the writ, the statute, if retrospective,

(a) *Per* Erle C.J., Id. Comp. W. 471; and *per* Cresswell J. in *Warne v. Beresford*, inf., 315. *Stocker v. Warner*, 1 C. B. 167.

(b) *Perry v. Skinner*, 2 M. & (c) *R. v. Mill*, 10 C. B. 379.

would have divested him of a right which he had acquired (a); and, for the like reasons, s. 146 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, which enacted that "the sheriff shall not under a writ of elegit deliver the goods of a debtor, nor shall a writ of elegit extend to goods," was held not to apply to a case where the writ had been issued, and the sheriff had taken possession before the Act came into operation, although the issue and seizure were after the passing of the Act, and the delivery after it came into operation (b).

The 14th section of the Mercantile Law Amendment Act, 1856, which provides that a debtor shall not lose the benefit of the Statute of Limitations by his co-debtor's payment of interest, or part payment of the principal, was held not to affect the efficacy of such a payment made before the Act was passed (c). A different decision would have deprived the creditor of a right of action against one of his debtors. The provision in the Judicature Act of 1875, that in winding up companies whose assets are insufficient, the bankruptcy rules as to the rights of creditors and other matters shall apply, was held not to reach back to a company already in liquidation when the Act was passed (d).

(a) *Williams v. Smith*, 4 H. & N. 559.

(c) *Jackson v. Woolley*, 8 E. & B. 778.

(b) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 52, s. 146; *Hough v. Windus*, 12 Q. B. D. 224.

(d) *Re Suche & Co.*, 1 Ch. D. 48.

The 23 & 24 Vict. c. 38, s. 4, which enacted that no judgment which had not already been, or should not thereafter be entered and docketed, should have any preference against heirs or personal representatives, in the administration of the property of the deceased debtor, did not, for a similar reason, extend to a judgment obtained against a debtor who had died before the Act was passed (*a*).

But a statute is not retrospective, in the sense under consideration, because a part of the requisites for its action is drawn from a time antecedent to its passing (*b*). If the debtor, in the case just mentioned, had not died until after the Act, the omission to register would have been fatal; as that step was made by the Act essential to the creditor's right, and it would not be giving a retrospective operation to the Act to apply it to a state of circumstances not past and complete, but continuing after it was passed.

The 5th section of the Mercantile Law Amendment Act, which entitles a surety who pays the debt of his principal, to an assignment of the securities for it held by the creditor, would apply to the case of a surety who had entered into the suretyship before the Act, but had paid off the debt after it came into operation (*c*). The 2nd section of the Infants' Relief

(*a*) *Evans v. Williams*, 2 Dr. 149. See *R. v. Portsea*, 7 Q. B. & S. 324. D. 384; *Exp. Dawson*, L. R.

(*b*) *Per* Lord Denman in *R.* 19 Eq. 433.

v. St. Mary Whitechapel, 12 Q. (c) *Re Cochran's Estate*, L. B. 127; *R. v. Christchurch*, Id. R. 5 Eq. 209.

Act, which enacts that no action shall be brought on a ratification, made after majority, of a contract made during infancy, was held to apply to ratifications of contracts made before the Act was passed (*a*). The Court of Chancery, which acquired jurisdiction, under the 23 & 24 Vict. c. 35, to relieve in respect of the forfeiture of a lease in consequence of a breach of a covenant to insure, exercised this new jurisdiction where the breach occurred after, but the lease had been made before the Act was passed (*b*). And the provision of the Conveyancing Act of 1881, which relieved tenants against forfeiture for breach of covenant, was held to apply to a case where judgment had been already given before the Act was passed, and the landlord might have obtained possession, but for a stay of proceedings to give the tenant time to appeal (*c*).

In general, when the law is altered pending an action, the rights of the parties are decided according to the law as it existed when the action was begun, unless the new statute shows a clear intention to vary such rights. Thus, the Medical Act, 21 & 22 Vict. c. 90, which enacts that no person shall, after the 1st of January, 1859, recover any charge for medical treatment "unless he shall prove at the trial" that he was on the Medical Register, was held not to apply to

(*a*) *Exp. Kibble*, L. R. 10 Ch. 373.

(*b*) *Page v. Bennett*, 2 Giff. 117.

(*c*) 44 & 45 Vict. c. 41, s. 14; *Quilter v. Mapleson*, 9 Q.

B. D. 672.

an action for medical services, begun before that date, but tried after it (*a*). An administration bond given to the Ordinary not being assignable until the 21 & 22 Vict. c. 95, an action begun by the assignee before that Act was passed, was held not maintainable after it came into operation (*b*).

If a statute is in its nature a declaratory Act, the argument that it must not be construed so as to take away previous rights is not applicable. Thus, where a statute passed in 1889 declared that the provisions of a statute of 1881, with regard to the imposition of stamp duties upon personal property passing under "voluntary settlements," should be construed as if marriage settlements were included, which until then had not been regarded as voluntary settlements, it was held that the provisions of the later Act were retrospective, and that the construction provided by it must be applied to the description of the property sought to be taxed, and this although the property passed to the beneficiaries, and the proceedings to recover the duty were taken, before the second Act came into force (*c*).

It is hardly necessary to add, that whenever the intention is clear that the Act should have a retro-

- (*a*) *Thistleton v. Frewer*, 31 N. 76.
L. J. Ex. 230; *Wright v. Greenroyd*, 1 B. & S. 758. *Comp.* 52 & 53 Vict. c. 7, s. 11;
Leman v. Housley, L. R. 10 Q. *Att.-Gen. v. Theobald*, 24 Q.
 B. 66. B. D. 557. See *Att.-Gen. v.*

- (*b*) *Young v. Hughes*, 4 H. & Hertford, 3 Ex. 670.

spective operation, it must unquestionably be so construed (*a*), even though the consequences may appear unjust and hard (*b*). Thus, an Act (33 & 34 Vict. c. 29, s. 14), which enacted that every person "convicted of felony" should for ever be disqualified from selling spirits by retail, and that if any such person should take out, or have taken out a license for that purpose, it should be void, was held to include a man who had been convicted of felony before, and had obtained a license after the Act was passed. Although the expression "convicted of felony" might have been limited to persons who should thereafter be convicted, yet, as the object of the Act was to protect the public from having beerhouses kept by men of bad character, the language was construed in the sense which best advanced the remedy and suppressed the mischief; though giving, perhaps, a retrospective operation to the enactment (*c*). The provision in the Bankrupt Act of 6 Geo. IV., which protected "all payments made or which should thereafter be made" by a bankrupt before his bankruptcy, necessarily had a retrospective effect, unless the expression of payments "made"

(*a*) See ex. gr. *Re Williams*, considered in *Re Pulborough School Board*, [1894] 1 Q. B. [1891] 2 Q. B. 257.

(*b*) See ex. gr. *Stead v. Carey*, 725; *Chappell v. Purday*, 12 1 C. B. 496; *Bell v. Bilton*, 4 M. & W. 303. As to the *Bing*. 615. effect of pardon in removing

(*c*) *Hitchcock v. Way*, 6 A. the disqualification see *Hay & E.* 947; *R. v. Vine*, L. R. 10 *v. Tower J.J.*, 24 Q. B. D. Q. B. 195, diss. *Lush J.*, 561.

were to be altogether nugatory (*a*). After the passing of Lord Tenterden's Act, 9 Geo. IV. c. 14, which enacted that in actions grounded upon simple contracts, no verbal promise should be "deemed sufficient evidence" of a new contract to bar the Statute of Limitations, it was held that such a promise given before the Act, and which was then sufficient to bar the statute, could not be received in evidence in an action begun before, but not tried till after the passing of the Act (*b*). This decision has been supported on the ground that the time for deciding what is or is not evidence, is when the trial takes place; and that when the Act told the judge what was and was not then to be evidence, he was bound to decide in obedience to it (*c*). But some stress is also to be laid on the circumstance that the Act did not come into operation until eight months after its passing; for the concession of this interval seemed to show that the hardship in question had been in the contemplation of the Legislature, and had been thus provided for (*d*). So, an Act which was passed in August, but was not to come into operation till October, making non-traders liable to bankruptcy, applied to a person who contracted a debt and com-

(*a*) *Churchill v. Crease*, 5 Bing. 177.

(*b*) *Hilliard v. Lenard*, M. & M. 297; *Towler v. Chatterton*, 6 Bing. 258.

(*c*) *Per Cresswell J. in Marsh v. Higgins*, 9 C. B. 551. But comp. sup., p. 308.

(*d*) *Per Park J.*, 6 Bing. 264.

mitted an act of bankruptcy between those dates. It was considered that no injustice was done, since the Act had told him what would be the consequence of contracting the debt, before he contracted it (a). On this ground, also, it was held that the 11 & 12 Vict. c. 43, s. 11, which limits the time for taking summary proceedings before justices to six months from the time when the matter complained of arose, was held fatal to proceedings begun after the passing of the Act, in respect of a matter which had arisen more than six months before it was passed (b); though the interval between the passing of the Act and its coming into operation was only six weeks. If the Act had come into immediate operation, it was observed, the hardship would have been so great, that the inference might have been against an intention to give it a retrospective operation; but the provision suspending its operation, for however short a time, was to be taken as an intimation that the Legislature had provided it as the period within which proceedings respecting antecedent matters might be taken (c).

In the same way the 10th section of the Mercantile Law Amendment Act, 1856, which enacted that no

(a) *Exp. Rashleigh*, 2 Ch. D. B. D. 586). See *per* Bovill C.J.
9. *Comp. Williams v. Harding*, in *Ings v. London and S. W.*
L. R. 1 H. L. 9. R. Co., L. R. 4 C. P. 19.

(b) *R. v. Leeds R. Co.*, 18 (c) *Per* Lord Campbell, 18
Q. B. 343 (overruled on another Q. B. 346.
point in *R. v. Edwards*, 13 Q.

person should be entitled to commence an action after the time limited, by reason of his being abroad or in prison, was held to apply to causes of action which had accrued before the Act was passed. But some weight was due to the circumstance that another section of the same Act kept alive in express terms a cause of action already accrued, and thus afforded the inference that no such intention had been entertained, as none was expressed, as regards cases under the 10th section (*a*).

In both of the above cases, however, the construction, though fatal to the enforcement of a vested right, by shortening the time for enforcing it, did not in terms take away any such right; and, in both, it seems to fall within the general principle that the presumption against a retrospective construction has no application to enactments which affect only the procedure and practice of the Courts (*b*), even where the alteration which the statute makes has been disadvantageous to one of the parties. Although to make a law for punishing that which, at the time when it was done, was not punishable, is contrary to sound principle; a law which merely alters the procedure may, with perfect propriety, be made applicable to past as well as future transactions (*c*); and no

(*a*) *Cornill v. Hudson*, 8 E. N. 227.

& B. 429; *Pardo v. Bingham*,
L. R. 4 Ch. 735.

(*c*) *Macaulay's Hist. Eng.*
vol. iii. 715; and vol. v. 43.

(*b*) *Wright v. Hale*, 6 H. &

secondary meaning is to be sought for an enactment of such a kind. No person has a vested right in any course of procedure (a). He has only the right of prosecution or defence in the manner prescribed for the time being, by or for the Court in which he sues; and if an Act of Parliament alters that mode of procedure, he has no other right than to proceed according to the altered mode (b). The remedy does not alter the contract or the tort; it takes away no vested right, for the defaulter can have no vested right in a state of the law which left the injured party without, or with only a defective, remedy. If the time for pleading were shortened, or new powers of amending were given, it would not be open to the parties to gainsay such a change; the only right thus interfered with being that of delaying or defeating justice; a right little worthy of respect (c).

The general principle, indeed, seems to be that alterations in the procedure are always retrospective, unless there be some good reason against it (d). Where,

(a) *Per* Mellish L.J. in *Costa Rica v. Erlanger*, 3 Ch. D. 69. See *ex. gr.* *The Dumfries and other cases*, *sup.*, 212.

(b) See the judgments of Wilde B. in *Wright v. Hale*, 30 L. J. Ex. 43; and of Lord Wensleydale in *Atty.-Gen. v. Sillem*, 10 H. L. 704; and *per* James L.J. in *Warner v. Mur-*

doch, 4 Ch. D. 752.

(c) See *ex. gr.* *Cornish v. Hockin*, 1 E. & B. 602; *Dash v. Van Kleeck*, 7 Johns. 503; *The People v. Tibbetts*, 4 Cowen, 392.

(d) See *per* Lord Blackburn in *Gardner v. Lucas*, 3 App. Cas. 603, and *Kimbray v. Draper*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 160.

for instance, the defendant pleaded to an action for a small sum, that the jurisdiction of the Court had been taken away by a Court of Requests Act, and that Act was repealed after the plea but before the trial; it was held that the plaintiff was entitled to judgment (*a*). When the Legislature gave a new remedy by the Admiralty Acts of 1840 and 1861, for enforcing rights in the Admiralty, those Acts were held to extend to rights which had accrued before the new remedy had been provided (*b*).

So, the provision of the Common Law Procedure Act of 1852, s. 128, that the plaintiff might issue execution within six years from the recovery of a judgment, without revival of the judgment, was held to apply to a judgment which had been recovered more than a year and a day before the Act was passed, and which therefore could not have been put in force under the previous state of the law without revival (*c*); and the power given to a married woman by the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, of suing in all respects as if she were a feme sole, was held to enable her to so sue in respect of torts or breaches of contract committed before the passing of the Act (*d*). The enactment

(*a*) *Warne v. Beresford*, 2 M. & W. 848.

(*b*) *The Alexander Larsen*, 1 W. Rob. 288. See *The Ironsides*, Lush. 458.

(*c*) *Boodle v. Davis*, 8 Ex. 351.

(*d*) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 75, s. 1, sub-s. 2; *Weldon v. Winslow*, 13 Q. B. D. 784. See also *Weldon v. De Bathe*, 14 Q. B. D. 339; *Lowe v. Fox*, 15 Q. B. D. 667. Compare *Re Lumley*, [1894] 3 Ch. 135.

6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, s. 37, which made attorneys' bills taxable, for work done out of Court, and which also provided that, from the passing of the Act, no attorney should bring an action for costs until a month after he had delivered his bill, was held to apply to costs incurred before the passing of the Act (*a*).

On this principle, it was held that the 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 42, s. 31, which provides that in actions brought by executors, the plaintiff shall be liable for costs, was applicable to an action begun before the Act came into operation (*b*); and though Littledale, J. (*c*), and afterwards Parke, B. (*d*), disapproved of the decision, it appears to have been generally concurred in by the Courts (*e*). So, the Common Law Procedure Act of 1860, which deprives a plaintiff, in an action for a wrong, of costs, if he recovers by verdict less than £5, unless the judge certifies in his favour, was held to apply to actions begun before the Act had come into operation, but tried after (*f*); and a similar effect was given to the County Courts Act of 1867, as

(*a*) *Binns v. Hey*, 1 Dowl. & L. 66; *Brooks v. Bockett*, 9 Q. B. 847; *Scadding v. Eyles*, Id. 858.

(*b*) *Freeman v. Moyes*, 1 A. & E. 338; *Pickup v. Wharton*, 2 C. & M. 405; *Grant v. Kemp*, Id. 636; *Exp. Dawson*, L. R. 19 Eq. 433.

(*c*) 1 A. & E. 341.

(*d*) *In Pinhorn v. Sonster*, 8 Ex. 138.

(*e*) *Per Channell B. in Wright v. Hale*, 30 L. J. Ex. 43; *per Wood V.C. in Re Lord*, 1 K. & J. 90.

(*f*) *Wright v. Hale*, 6 H. & N. 227.

regards giving security for costs (*a*). The provision which extended the time for making decrees nisi absolute from three to six months, applied to suits pending when the Act came into operation (*b*).

But the new procedure would be presumably inapplicable, where its application would prejudice rights established under the old (*c*); or would involve a breach of faith between the parties. For this reason, those provisions of the Common Law Procedure Act of 1854, s. 32, which permitted error to be brought on a judgment upon a special case, and gave an appeal upon a point reserved at the trial, were held not to apply where the special case was agreed to, and the point was reserved before the Act came into operation (*d*).

Where a special demurrer stood for argument before the passing of the first Common Law Procedure Act, it was held that the judgment was not to be affected by that Act, which abolished special demurrers, but must be governed by the earlier law (*e*). The judgment was, in strictness, due before the Act, and the delay of the Court ought not to affect it.

(*a*) *Kimbray v. Draper*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 160.

(*b*) *Watton v. Watton*, 1 P. & M. 227.

(*c*) *Exp. Phoenix Bessemer Co.*, 45 L. J. Ch. 11.

(*d*) *Hughes v. Lumley*, 24

L. J. Q. B. 29; *Vansittart v. Taylor*, 4 E. & B. 910.

(*e*) *Pinhorn v. Sonster*, 21 L. J. Ex. 336. See also *R. v. Crowan*, 14 Q. B. 221; *Hobson v. Neale*, 8 Ex. 131.

In considering whether a statute was intended to be retrospective in its operation, reference has been made to prescribed forms appended to rules made under the statute, and to the fact that their being headed "the day of , 189 ," indicated that they were not intended to apply to a period before 1890 (*a*).

(*a*) 53 & 54 Vict. c. 71, s. 25; *Re Norman*, [1893] 2 Q. B. 369.

CHAPTER IX.

SECTION I.—MODIFICATION OF THE LANGUAGE TO MEET THE INTENTION.

WHERE the language of a statute, in its ordinary meaning and grammatical construction, leads to a manifest contradiction of the apparent purpose of the enactment, or to some inconvenience or absurdity, hardship, or injustice, presumably not intended, a construction may be put upon it which modifies the meaning of the words, and even the structure of the sentence (*a*). This may be done by departing from the rules of grammar; by giving an unusual meaning to particular words; by altering their collocation; by rejecting them altogether; or by interpolating other words; under the influence, no doubt, of an irresistible conviction, that the Legislature could not possibly have intended what its words signify, and

(*a*) See *per* Alderson B. in *Becke v. Smith*, 2 M. & W. Atty.-Gen. *v.* Lockwood, 9 M. 195; *Wright v. Williams*, 1 M. & W. 398, and *Miller v. Salomons*, 7 Ex. 475; *per* Lord Palmer, 4 Ex. 267; *per* James Denman in *Jubb v. Hull Dock Co.*, 9 Q. B. 443; *per* Lord L.J. in *Exp. Rashleigh*, 2 Ch. D. 13; *Grot. de B. & P. b.* 2, c. 16, s. 12 (4).
16 Q. B. 503; *per* Parke B. in

that the modifications thus made are mere corrections of careless language, and really give the true intention. Where the main object and intention of a statute are clear, it must not be reduced to a nullity by the draftsman's unskilfulness or ignorance of the law, except in a case of necessity, or the absolute intractability of the language used (*a*). The rules of grammar yield readily in such cases to those of common sense.

In a case already mentioned (*b*), where a Colonial ordinance, passed to give effect to the treaty between this country and China, authorised the extradition to the Chinese Government of any of its subjects charged with having committed "any crime or offence against the laws of China," the Privy Council construed these words as limited to those crimes and offences which are punishable by the laws of all civilised nations; and as not including acts which, though against the laws of China, would be innocent in Europe (*c*). As the literal meaning of the words was wide enough to include political offences against the law of a foreign State, an English Court might feel bound to think it impossible that they could have been used in that sense. But it might be doubted whether the other party to the treaty understood our stipulation in the same narrow sense; or, indeed,

(*a*) *Salmon v. Duncombe*, 11 App. Cas. 627.

(*b*) P. 34.

(*c*) *Atty.-Gen. v. Kwok Ah Sing*, L. R. 5 P. C. 197.

whether it did not understand it as including, above all others, those crimes which all Governments are most desirous to punish, viz., those against themselves (a). Where the clearly expressed intention of a Colonial ordinance was to give to any subject of the Queen resident in the colony the power of disposing by will according to English law of property both real and personal, which otherwise would devolve according to the law of the colony, and where a section of the ordinance was operative for that purpose, except that it concluded with the provision "as if such subject resided in England," the effect of which would be to leave both the *lex situs* and the *lex domicilii* in operation, thus reducing the section to a nullity, it was held that the concluding words ought not to be so construed as to destroy all that had gone before, and therefore should be treated as immaterial, the powers conferred not being affected by the question of residence in England (b). When it was settled that the Statute of Limitations, 21 Jac. I. c. 16, applied to India (c), it was necessary to construe, for that purpose, the expression "beyond the seas," as meaning out of the territories (d). The same statute, which, after limiting the time for suing, gave a further period to persons

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (a) The same wide expressions | App. Cas. 627. |
| are used in the 34 & 35 Vict. c. 8, | (c) E. I. Co. v. Paul, 7 Moo. 85. |
| and in the 37 & 38 Vict. c. 38. | (d) Ruckmaboye v. Lullooboy, |
| (b) Salmon v. Duncombe, 11 | 8 Moo. 4. |

An Act which made it penal "to be in possession of game after the last day" allowed for shooting, would, if construed literally, include cases where the possession had begun before the last day, and therefore lawfully; and to avoid this injustice, it was construed as applying only where the possession did not begin until after the close of the season; that is, the words "to begin" were interpolated before "to be in possession" (c). Where one section enacted that if the plaintiff recovered a sum "not exceeding" £5 he should have no costs, and another, that if he recovered "less than" £5, and the judge certi-

(a) *Townsend v. Deacon*, 3 [1892] 1 Q. B. 136.
Ex. 707; and see *Forbes v.*
Smith, 11 Ex. 161.
(c) 2 Geo. III. c. 19, 39
(b) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 49; *Re* Geo. III. c. 34; *Simpson v.*
Eyre & Corpn. of Leicester, Unwin, 3 B. & Ad. 134.

fied, he should have his costs; the literal meaning of the last clause leaving it inoperative where the sum recovered was exactly £5, it was held, to avoid imputing so incongruous and improbable an intention to the Legislature, that the words "less than" should be read as equivalent to "not exceeding" (a). The Insolvent Act, which invalidated voluntary conveyances made by insolvents "within three months before the commencement of the imprisonment," which, literally, would exclude the time of imprisonment, was construed as if the words had been "within a period commencing three months before the imprisonment." The literal construction, in leaving uninvalidated voluntary conveyances made after the imprisonment had begun, would have led to an incongruity which the Legislature could not be supposed to have intended (b). The 65th section of the County Courts Act, 1888, which provides that, where the claim in an action of contract does not exceed £100, a Judge of the High Court may order the action to be tried in any County Court "in which the action might have been commenced," was construed with the addition of the words "if it had been a County Court action," as otherwise the enactment would have been insensible and inoperative (c).

(a) *Garby v. Harris*, 7 Ex. 591.

(b) *Becke v. Smith*, 2 M. & W. 198.

(c) 51 & 52 Vict. c. 43; *Curtis v. Stovin*, 22 Q. B. D. 513; and see *Burkhill v. Thomas*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 312.

The Bankruptcy Act of 1869, providing that all the property acquired by the bankrupt "during the continuance" of the bankruptcy should be divisible among his creditors, and providing also that he might obtain his discharge not only at the close, but during the continuance of his bankruptcy, it was held that the earlier passage must be read in substance as meaning that the future property which was to be divisible, was that acquired either during the continuance of the bankruptcy or the earlier discharge of the bankrupt. This construction was deemed necessary to avoid leaving the bankrupt incapable of acquiring property after he had given up everything to his creditors, simply because the property had not been realised, and consequently the bankruptcy not closed (a).

It is obvious that the provisions in numerous statutes which limit the time and regulate the procedure for legal proceedings for compensation for acts done in the execution of his office by a justice or other person, or "under" or "by virtue," or "in pursuance" of his authority, do not mean what the words, in their plain and unequivocal sense, convey; since an act done in accordance with law is not actionable, and therefore needs no special statutory protection (b). Such provisions are obviously in-

(a) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, ss. (b) *Per Cur.* in *Hughes v.*
15 & 48; *Ebbs v. Boulnois*, *Buckland*, 15 M. & W. 346.
L. R. 10 Ch. 479.

tended to protect, under certain circumstances, acts which are not legal or justifiable (*a*) ; and the meaning given to them by a great number of decisions seems, in the result, to be that they give protection in all cases where the defendant did, or neglected (*b*) what is complained of, under colour of the statute ; that is, being within the general purview of it, and with the honest intention of acting as it authorised, though he might be ignorant of the existence of the Act ; and actually, whether reasonably or not, believing in the existence of such facts or state of things as would, if really existing, have justified his conduct (*c*). Thus, if an Act authorised the arrest of a person who entered the dwelling-house of another at night with intent to commit a felony (24 & 25 Vict.

(*a*) See *ex. gr. Warne v. & N. 271 ; Hopkins v. Crowe,* 4 A. & E. 774 ; *Kine v. Varley, 6 T. R. 443.*

(*b*) *Wilson v. Halifax, L. R. 3 Ex. 114 ; Newton v. Ellis, 5 E. & B. 115.*

(*c*) See, among many other authorities, *Greenway v. Hurd, 4 T. R. 553 ; Parton v. Williams, 3 B. & Ald. 330 ; Roberts v. Orchard, 2 H. & C. 769 ; Hughes v. Buckland, 15 M. & W. 346 ; Booth v. Clive, 10 C. B. 827 ; Carpue v. London and Brighton R. Co., 5 Q. B. 747 ; Tarrant v. Baker, 14 C. B. 199 ; Burling v. Harley, 3 H. & N. 271 ; Hopkins v. Crowe, 4 A. & E. 774 ; Kine v. Evershed, 10 Q. B. 143 ; Hermann v. Seneschal, 13 C. B. N. S. 392 ; Downing v. Capel, L. R. 2 C. P. 461 ; Leete v. Hart, L. R. 3 C. P. 322 ; Chamberlain v. King, L. R. 6 C. P. 474 ; Selmes v. Judge, L. R. 6 Q. B. 724 ; Midland Ry. v. Withington Loc. Bd., 11 Q. B. D. 788 ; Mason v. Aird, 51 L. J. Q. B. 244 ; Denny v. Thwaites, 2 Ex. D. 21 ; Downing v. Capel, L. R. 2 C. P. 461.*

c. 96, s. 51), an arrest made in the honest and not unreasonable, but mistaken belief that the person arrested had entered with that intent, would be protected. But he would not be protected if he had acted under a misconception, not of the facts, but of the law; as if, for instance, his belief was that the person had only attempted to enter; a different offence, for which the enactment in question does not authorise arrest; or if, where the law justified an immediate apprehension, an arrest was made which was not immediate (α). The unreasonableness of the belief is immaterial, if the belief be honest; though it is an important element in determining the question of honesty (b).

An Act (26 & 27 Vict. c. 29) which enacted that no witness before an election inquiry should be excused from answering self-criminating questions relating to corrupt practices at the election under inquiry, and entitled him, when he answered every question relating to those matters, to a certificate of indemnity declaring that he had answered all such criminating questions, was held to apply only where the witness answered "truly in the opinion of the "commissioners"; for it was not to be supposed that any answer, however false or contemptuous, was equally intended (c). It is observable that this inter-

(α) *Griffith v. Taylor*, 2 C. 3 Q. B. D. 237.

P. D. 194; *Morgan v. Palmer*, (c) *R. v. Hulme*, L. R. 5 Q. 2 B. & C. 729. B. 377; *R. v. Holl*, 7 Q. B. D.

(b) See *Clarke v. Molyneux*, 575.

polation was made in the Act, notwithstanding that it repealed an earlier enactment which had protected the witness only when he made "true" discovery.

The 374th section of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, which enacts that no license granted by the Trinity House to pilots "shall continue in force beyond "the 31st of January," after its date, but that "the "same may be renewed on such 31st of January in "every year, or any subsequent day," was construed as meaning, not that the renewed licenses must be issued on or after that day, but that they should take effect from the 31st of January. This departure from the strict letter was justified by the great inconvenience which would have resulted from a rigid adherence to it, since it would have left the whole district for a certain period, probably days, possibly weeks, without qualified pilots (*a*).

In the 7th section of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act of 1854, which enacts that railway and canal companies shall be liable for the loss or any injury done to "any horses, cattle, or other animals" (which would include a dog) entrusted to them for carriage, with the proviso that no greater damages should be recovered for the loss of, or injury done to "any of "such animals" beyond the sums thereafter mentioned — specifying certain sums for horses, neat cattle, sheep and pigs, but making no mention of dogs—the proviso was read, in order to reconcile it

(*a*) The Beta, 3 Moo. N. S. 23.

with the enacting part, as dealing only with “any of *the following* of such animals” (a). Where a railway company was made liable to make good the deficiency in the parochial rates arising from their having taken rateable property, “until its works were completed and liable to assessment,” the House of Lords held that the intention was that the liability should cease as regards any one parish, as soon as that portion of the line which ran through it was completed; in other words, that the Act was to be read as fixing the liability when “its works *in the parish* were completed” (b).

A case in the Queen's Bench may be cited as furnishing a remarkable example of judicial modification for the purpose of supplying an apparent case of omission, and avoiding an injustice and absurdity, such as the Legislature was presumed not to have intended. Under the 11 & 12 Vict. c. 110, an insolvent prisoner for debt might be discharged from imprisonment, either upon his own petition, or upon the petition of any of his creditors. The 10 & 11 Vict. c. 102, in abolishing the circuits of the Insolvent Commissioners, and transferring their jurisdiction to the County Courts, provided that “if an insolvent

(a) *Harrison v. London and Brighton R. Co.*, 2 B. & S. 122; interpolation in *Perry v. Skinner*, 2 M. & W. 471, sup., p. 305.
 reversed on another point, *Id.* (b) *East London R. Co. v. 152*; *R. v. Strachan*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 463. See another instance of *Whitechurch*, L. R. 7 H. L. 89, sup., p. 24.

“petitions,” the Insolvent Court should refer his petition to the Court of the district where he was imprisoned; but it omitted all mention of cases where the petitioner was a creditor. The Court, however, considered that an intention to include the latter sufficiently appeared. To confine the section to its literal meaning would involve the unjust result that, though a vesting order might be made, and the debtor be deprived of his property, he would remain imprisoned. The words “if an insolvent petitions” were accordingly understood to have merely put that case as an example of the more general intention, viz., “if a petition be presented.” For the purposes of the Legislature, it was immaterial whether the petition was the insolvent’s or the creditor’s (*a*).

Again, notwithstanding the general rule that full effect must be given to every word, if no sensible meaning can be given to a word or phrase, or if it would defeat the real object of the enactment, it may, or rather it should, be eliminated (*b*). The words of a statute must be construed so as to give a sensible meaning to them if possible. They ought to be construed *ut res magis valeat quam pereat* (*c*).

(*a*) *R. v. Dowling*, 8 E. & B. 605; *Exp. Greenwood*, 27 L. J. Q. B. 28, S. C. in that case the elimination was not necessary, 2 C. P. D. 99; and in *Plant v. Potts*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 256.

(*b*) *Per* Lord Abinger in *Lyde v. Barnard*, 1 M. & W. 115; *per* Brett L.J. in *Stone v. Yeovil*, 1 C. P. D. 701; though

(*c*) *Per* Bowen L.J. in *Curtis v. Stovin*, 22 Q. B. D. 513; and

The Carrier's Act, 1 Will. IV. c. 68, which enacts that a carrier shall not be responsible for the loss of articles delivered for carriage, unless the sender declares their value and nature, at the time of delivery, "at the office" of the carrier, was held to protect the carrier, where the parcel had been delivered to his servant elsewhere than at the office, and no declaration had been made either there or elsewhere; the fair meaning of the statute, and the paramount object of the Legislature being that the carrier should in every case be apprised of the nature and value of the article entrusted to him, whether it was delivered at the office or elsewhere (*a*).

An Act (25 & 26 Vict. c. 114) which authorised constables to search any person whom they suspected of coming from any land in unlawful pursuit of game, and, if any game was found upon him, to detain and summon him, was held to authorise a constable to summon a man whom he saw on a footway, with a gun in his hand, picking up a rabbit thrown from an adjoining enclosure, just after the report of a gun, but whom he did not search. There was nothing in the general object of the Act to lead to the supposition that "the enormous absurdity" of requiring an actual bodily search under such circumstances was intended; and such a departure from the language of the Act was therefore considered as really meeting the true

per Lindley L.J. in *The Duke of Buccleuch*, 15 P. D. 86.

(*a*) *Bixendale v. Hart*, 6 Ex. 769; *per* Cam. Scac.

intention (a). The Extradition Act, which authorises the “apprehension” of a person on warrant, includes the detention of one already in custody, though arrested without a warrant (b). So, the 35 Geo. III. c. 101, which empowered justices to suspend, in case of sickness, the order of removal of any pauper who should be “brought before them for the purpose of “being removed,” was construed as authorising such suspension without the actual bringing up of the pauper before the justices ; as the literal construction would have defeated the humane object of the enactment (c). And to prevent the enormous injustice which would result from a literal interpretation of the enactment that the Court of Bankruptcy should refuse a bankrupt his discharge in all cases where the debtor had committed an offence “under the Debtors Act, “1869,” it was held that the words “connected with “or arising out of the bankruptcy” must be added to qualify the general words (d).

To carry out the intention of the Legislature, it is occasionally found necessary to read the conjunctions

- | | |
|--|---|
| (a) <i>Hall v. Knox</i> , 4 B. & S. 515 ; <i>Lloyd v. Lloyd</i> , 14 Q. B. D. 725, which discusses <i>Clarke v. Crowder</i> , L. R. 4 C. P. 638, and <i>Turner v. Morgan</i> , L. R. 10 C. P. 587, where the statute was construed strictly. See also <i>sup.</i> , p. 287. <i>Comp. Vinter v.</i> | <i>Hind</i> , 10 Q. B. D. 63. (b) 33 & 34 Vict. c. 52, s. 8 ; <i>R. v. Weil</i> , 9 Q. B. D. 701. (c) <i>R. v. Everdon</i> , 9 East, 101. (d) 50 & 51 Vict. c. 66, s. 2 ; <i>Re Brocklebank</i> , 23 Q. B. D. 461. |
|--|---|

“or” and “and,” one for the other. The Statute of Charitable Uses, for instance, which speaks of property to be employed for the maintenance of “sick *and* “maimed soldiers,” referred to soldiers who were either the one “or” the other, and not only to those who were both (a).

The 1 Jac. I. c. 15, which made it an act of bankruptcy for a trader to leave his dwelling-house “to the “intent, *or* whereby his creditors might be defeated or “delayed,” if construed literally, would have exposed to bankruptcy every trader who left his home even for an hour, if a creditor called during his absence for payment. This absurd consequence was avoided, and the real intention of the Legislature beyond reasonable doubt effected, by reading “or” as “and”; so that an absence from home was an act of bankruptcy only when coupled with the design of delaying or defeating creditors (b).

The converse change was made in a turnpike Act which imposed one toll on every carriage drawn by four horses, and another on every horse, laden or not laden, but not drawing; and provided that not more than one toll should be demanded for repassing on the same day “with the same horses *and* carriages.” It was held that the real intention of the Legislature required that this “and” should be read as “or,” and that a carriage repassing with different horses was not liable to a second toll. The toll was imposed on the

(a) Duke, Charit. Uses, 127. 509. See also *R. v. Mortlake*, 6

(b) *Fowler v. Padget*, 7 T. R. East, 397.

carriage; and it was immaterial whether it was drawn by the same or different horses (*a*). In the provision of the Metropolitan Local Management Act, that no road shall be formed as a street for carriage traffic unless widened to forty feet, *or* unless such street shall be open at both ends, the word “or” was read “nor,” for the manifest intention was not that one of the two, but that both conditions should be complied with; that is, that the street should not only be forty feet wide, but also be open at both ends (*b*).

This substitution of conjunctions, however, has been sometimes made without sufficient reason; and it has been doubted whether some of the cases of turning “or” into “and,” and *vice versa*, have not gone to the extreme limit of interpretation (*c*). It may be questioned, for instance, whether the judges who “were at the making” of the statute 2 Hen. V. c. 3, which required that jurors to try an action when the debt “or” damages amounted to forty marks, should have land worth forty shillings, were justified in construing it “by equity,” and converting the disjunctive “or” into “and” (*d*). The Court of Queen’s Bench, on one occasion, held that the power given to justices by the Highway Act, 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 50, to order

- | | |
|--|--|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Waterhouse v. Keen</i> , 6 Dowl. & R. 257, wrongly reported in the marginal note in 4 B. & C. 200. | 59 L. J. M. C. 112. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Metrop. Board v. Steed</i> , 8 Q. B. D. 445; <i>Daw v. L.C.C.</i> , | (<i>c</i>) <i>Per</i> Lord Halsbury L.C. in <i>Mersey Docks v. Henderson</i> , 13 App. Cas. 603. |
| | (<i>d</i>) Co. Litt. 272a. |

the diversion of a highway, when it appeared “nearer “*or* more commodious to the public,” was limited to cases where the new road was both nearer *and* more commodious (*a*); but the same Court more recently held that the power was exercisable when the new road was either the one *or* the other (*b*).

Statutes which authorise persons to do acts for the benefit of others, or, as it is sometimes said, for the public good or the advancement of justice, have often given rise to controversy when conferring the authority in terms simply enabling and not mandatory. In enacting that they “may,” or “shall, if they think “fit,” or, “shall have power,” or that “it shall be “lawful” for them to do such acts, a statute appears to use the language of mere permission; but it has been so often decided as to have become an axiom that in such cases, such expressions may have—to say the least—a compulsory force (*c*), and so would seem to be modified by judicial exposition. On the other hand, in some cases, the authorised person is invested with a discretion, and then those expressions seem divested of that compulsory force.

In an early case, where it was contended that the 13 & 14 Car. II. c. 12, in enacting that the church-

(*a*) *R. v. Shiles*, 1 Q. B. 919. *Ramsay*, 8 Ex. 879; *Oldfield v.*

(*b*) *R. v. Phillips*, L. R. 1 Q. *Dodd*, 8 Ex. 578.

B. 648; *Wright v. Frant*, 4 B. (*c*) *Per Cur.* in *R. v. Tithe*
& *S. 118*. See *Harrington v. Commrs.*, 14 Q. B. 474.

wardens and overseers “ shall have power and “ authority ” to make a rate to reimburse parish constables certain expenses, left it optional with them to make it or not, the Court held that it was obligatory on them to make it, whenever disbursements had been made and not been paid. “ May be done,” it was observed, is always understood in such cases as “ must be done ” (*a*). So, where a statute directed that churchwardens should deliver their accounts to justices, and enacted that the latter “ shall and “ they are hereby authorised and empowered, if they “ shall so think fit,” to examine the accounts, and disallow unfounded charges, it was held that the justices could not decline to enter upon the examination (*b*), or be at liberty to allow charges not sanctioned by law (*c*). Though the 11 & 12 Vict. c. 42, s. 9, enacts that justices “ may ” issue a summons on an information laid before them, only “ if they shall think fit,” it was held that they were not at liberty to refuse it on any extraneous considerations, such as that the prosecution was inexpedient, or that the law would operate unjustly in the particular case (*d*). A charter which

(*a*) *R. v. Barlow*, Carth. 293;
R. v. Derby, Skin. 370, S. C.

(*b*) *R. v. Cambridge*, 8 Dowl.
89; *per Bramwell L.J.*, in *R. v.*
Bp. of Oxford, 4 Q. B. D. at p.
545. *Comp. R. v. Norfolk*, 4 B.
& Ad. 238.

(*c*) *Barton v. Pigott*, L. R.
10 Q. B. 86.

(*d*) *R. v. Adamson*, 1 Q. B. D.
201; *R. v. Fawcett*, 11 Cox,
305; *Exp. Lewis*, 21 Q. B. D.
201; *R. v. Byrde*, 60 L. J.
M. C. 17.

granted to the steward and suitors of a manor "power and authority" to hold a Court to hear civil suits, was held to make it obligatory to hold it when necessary (a). Again, the Tithe Commutation Act (5 & 6 Vict. c. 54, s. 7) which enacts that if any agreement for the commutation of tithes made before the Act, which was not of legal validity, should appear to the Tithe Commissioners to give a fair equivalent for the tithe, they "shall be empowered" to confirm it, or, if unfair, to confirm it nevertheless, and to award such a rent-charge as would make it a proper equivalent, and to extinguish the tithe; it was considered that the Commissioners were bound to make any such agreement between the parties the basis of their own settlement, and were not at liberty to throw it wholly aside in carrying out the general policy of the Act, viz., tithe extinction (b).

So, in *Backwell's Case*, Lord Keeper North held, and of the same opinion were all the judges, that the statute which enacted that the Chancellor "should have full power" to issue a commission of bankruptcy against a bankrupt trader, on the petition of his creditors, imperatively required its issue; declaring that "may" was in effect "must" (c). Under the

(a) *R. v. Havering-atte-Bower*, 5 B. & A. 691; *R. v. Hastings*, Id. 692n., both better reported in 2 D. & R. 176, and 1 D. & R. 148.

(b) *R. v. Tithe Comm.*, 14 Q. B. 474.

(c) 13 Eliz. c. 7; 1 Jac. c. 15; *Backwell's Case*, 1 Vern. 152.

County Court Act, which enacted that the Superior Court “may” give the plaintiff the costs of his action, if he lived more than twenty miles from the defendant, it was held that the Court was bound to give them in every case in which the plaintiff and defendant dwelt more than that distance apart (*a*). Under the provision of s. 5 of the Arbitration Act, 1889, that where a submission provides that the reference shall be to a single arbitrator, and all parties do not concur in appointing an arbitrator, any party may serve the other parties with a written notice to appoint, and if the appointment is not made in seven clear days, the Court “may,” on the application of the party who gave the notice, appoint an arbitrator, it is obligatory on the Court to make an appointment if applied to (*b*). The General Order which makes it “lawful” for the Court to order the production of such documents in the possession of a party relating to the action, “as the Court thinks “right,” gave the Court no discretion to refuse an inspection in any case where the documents were not privileged by law from inspection (*c*). An Act which made it “lawful” for a Court to stay proceedings in actions against companies under liquidation until

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) McDougal v. Paterson, 11 C. B. 755 ; acc. <i>Crake v. Powell</i>, 2 E. & B. 210, overruling <i>Jones v. Harrison</i>, 6 Ex. 328.</p> | <p><i>Re Eyre and Leicester Corpn.</i>, [1892] 1 Q. B. 136.</p> |
| <p>(<i>b</i>) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 49, s. 5 ;</p> | <p>(<i>c</i>) <i>Judic. A.</i> 1875, Ord. 31, r. 11 ; <i>Bustros v. White</i>, 1 Q. B. D. 423.</p> |

proof of the plaintiff's debt (*a*) ; and one of the bankruptcy rules which provides that where the Court has given no directions as to the disallowance of the costs of improper or unnecessary proceedings, the taxing-master "may" look into the question, were held equally imperative (*b*). So the provision of s. 56 of the Corrupt Practices Act, 1883, that certain jurisdiction conferred by the Act "may" be exercised by one of the judges for the time being on the rota for the trial of election petitions, it is to be read as equivalent to "must," and the jurisdiction cannot be exercised by any other judge (*c*). An Act which empowered a vestry to make a paving rate, and provided that when it appeared to the vestry that the rate was not incurred for the equal benefit of the whole parish, it "might" exempt the party not benefited, was held to impose a duty and not merely to confer a power on the vestry, to apportion the burden when the case arose (*d*).

On the other hand, where it was enacted that "it should be lawful" for the Superior Courts to issue commissions to examine witnesses abroad, it was held that the Court was not bound to issue such a commission simply on proof that the persons whose evidence

(*a*) *Marson v. Lund*, 13 Q. B. 664. *Shaw v. Reckitt*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 779.

(*b*) *Baines v. Wormsley*, 47 L. J. Ch. 844 ; Add. Rules, 1875, r. 18. (*d*) *Howell v. London Dock Co.*, 8 E. & B. 212. See *Dormont v. Furness Ry. Co.*,

(*c*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 51 ; 11 Q. B. D. 496.

was required were abroad, but that it was in the discretion of the Court to determine upon the special circumstances of each case, whether it was advisable in the interests of justice to issue it or not (*a*). So, under a statute which enacted that where a county bridge is narrow, "it shall and may be lawful" for the Quarter Sessions to order it to be widened, it was held, having regard to the nature of the Court entrusted with the power, and to the subject matter, which might involve other considerations besides the width of the bridge, such as the cost of the proposed work and its possible disproportion to any public benefit likely to be derived from it, that it was discretionary to make the order or not (*b*). Again, the enactment that if part of the consideration for an annuity were returned, or paid in goods, or retained on any pretence, "it should be "lawful" for the Court to cancel the annuity deed, if it should appear that "any such practices" had been used; the Court considered that this last expression limited the enactment to cases where any of the forbidden acts had been done *malo animo*, and held that it was in their discretion to set the deed aside or not (*c*). The Church Discipline Act, which enacts that in every case of a clergyman charged with an ecclesiastical

(*a*) 1 Will. IV. c. 22; *Cas-* Newport Bridge, 2 E. & E.
telli v. Groom, 18 Q. B. 490. 377.

See *Armour v. Walker*, 25 Ch. D. 673; (*c*) 5 Geo. IV. c. 141, s. 6;
Lawson v. Vacuum Barber *v. Gamson*, 4 B. & Ald.
Brake Co., 27 Ch. D. 137. 281; *Girdlestone v. Allan*, 1 B.

(*b*) 43 Geo. III. c. 59; *Re* & C. 61.

offence, or concerning whom a scandal may exist of having committed such an offence, "it shall be lawful" for the bishop, on the application of any person complaining of it, or if he thinks fit, on his own motion, to appoint a commission to examine witnesses, to ascertain if there be sufficient *prima facie* ground for instituting further proceedings, was held to leave it discretionary with the bishop to appoint a commission, on receiving such a complaint. Having regard to the pre-existing state of the law and the character of the bishop's office, it was considered that it was his duty, before issuing the commission, to determine on the expediency of instituting the prosecution, taking into his consideration the nature, credibility, or importance of the charge, and the status, solvency, and religious character of the complainant, as well as the general interests of the Church (*a*).

This subject underwent much discussion in the last-mentioned case, and elicited various views. The Queen's Bench held that it was imperative to issue the commission where a complaint had been made of an ecclesiastical offence (*b*), but the Court of Appeal reversed this decision (*c*), and this reversal was upheld on appeal to the House of Lords, who were practically unanimous in their view.

(*a*) 3 & 4 Vict. c. 86; *R. v. Oxford* (Bp.), 4 Q. B. D. 525; *Julius v. Oxford* (Bp.), 5 App. Cas. 214; *Allcroft v. London* (Bp.), [1891] A. C. 666; *R. v. Chichester* (Bp.), 2 E. & E. 209.
 (*b*) 4 Q. B. D. 245.
 (*c*) *Id.* p. 525.

According to Lord Cairns, such words as "it shall be lawful," are always simply permissive (a) or enabling. They confer a power, and do not, of themselves, do more. But there may be something in the nature of the thing empowered to be done, something in the object for which it is to be done, something in the conditions under which it is to be done, something in the title of the persons for whose benefit the power is to be exercised, which may couple the power with a duty, and make it the duty of the person in whom the power is reposed to exercise it when called upon to do so; it lies on those who contend that an obligation exists to exercise the power, to show in the circumstances of the case something which, according to the above principles, created that obligation; and the cases decide only that where a power is deposited with a public officer for the purpose of being used for the benefit of persons who are specifically pointed out, and with regard to whom a definition is supplied by the Legislature of the conditions upon which they are entitled to call for its exercise, that power ought to be exercised, and the Court will require it to be exercised (b). Lord Penzance said that the words "it shall be lawful" are distinctly words of permission only, and the true question is, not whether they mean something different, but whether, having regard to all the circumstances—to the person enabled, to the general object of the statute, and to

(a) 5 App. Cas. p. 222.

(b) Id. p. 225.

the persons for whose benefit the power may have been intended to be conferred—they do or do not create a duty in the person on whom it is conferred to exercise it. It is not enough that the thing empowered to be done should be for the public benefit in order to make it imperative to exercise that power on all occasions falling within the statute. It may be assumed that all powers conferred by statute on individuals in general public Acts are for the public benefit, or they would not have been conferred. He could find no specific authority for the proposition that in a certain class of statutes such words as “it shall be lawful” import, *prima facie*, not permission but obligation. The effect of the cases in which the exercise of the power conferred was held to be obligatory was that, though the statutes concerned had in terms only conferred a power, the circumstances were such as to create a duty, to show that the exercise of any discretion by the person empowered could not have been intended (a). Lord Selborne’s view was that words such as “it shall be lawful” are not ambiguous and susceptible either of a discretionary or an obligatory sense, but their meaning is the same, whether there is or is not a duty or obligation to use the power which they confer. They are potential, and never (in themselves) significant of any obligation. The question whether a judge or public officer, to whom a power

(a) 5 App. Cas. p. 228.

is given by such words, is bound to use it upon any particular occasion, or in any particular manner, must be solved *aliunde*, and in general it is to be solved from the context, from the particular provisions, or from the general scope and objects, of the enactment conferring the power (a). Lord Blackburn's opinion was that the enabling words gave a power which *primâ facie* might be exercised or not; but if the object for which the power is conferred is for the purpose of enforcing a right, whether public or private, there may be a duty cast upon the donee of the power to exercise it for the benefit of those who have that right, when required on their behalf. Where there is such a duty, it is not inaccurate to say that the words conferring the power are equivalent to saying that the donee must exercise it (b). But he could not agree with the view that whenever the statute is for the public good, and of general interest and concern, powers conferred by enabling words are *primâ facie* to be considered powers which must be exercised (c).

More recently the Court of Appeal, in considering the provision of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, s. 125, sub-s. 4, that any Court in which proceedings have been commenced for the administration of a deceased debtor's estate, "may," on the application of any creditor, and on proof that the estate is insolvent,

(a) 5 App. Cas. p. 235.

(c) Id. p. 245.

(b) Id. p. 241.

transfer the administration to the Court exercising jurisdiction in bankruptcy, decided that there was not enough in the statute to show that the power conferred must be exercised whenever the estate is shown to be insolvent, and it was consequently a discretionary power which the Court might refuse to use. Following the decision of the House of Lords in the preceding case it was said that from the nature of the English language the word "may" can never mean "must," that it is only potential, and when it is employed there is another question to be decided, viz., whether there is anything that makes it the duty of the person on whom the power is conferred to exercise that power. If not, the exercise is discretionary. But when the power is coupled with a duty of the person to whom it is given to exercise it, then it is imperative (*a*).

Accordingly, when a statute enacts that a candidate at an election "may" be present at the polling place, or that a clergyman accused of an ecclesiastical offence "may" attend the proceedings of the commission appointed to inquire into the accusation, or that a company "may" construct a railway (*b*), or that a plaintiff "may" sue in one action for injury

(*a*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 52; *Re Baker*, 44 Ch. D. 262; *Re Johannisberg Co.*, [1892] 1 Ch. 583. *Co. v. R.*, 1 E. & B. 858; *G. W. R. v. R.*, 1 E. & B. 874; *Darlaston Loc. Bd. v. L. & N. W. Ry. Co.*, [1894] 2 Q. B. 694. See also

(*b*) *York & N. Midland Ry. Nicholl v. Allen*, 1 B. & S. 934.

done to his wife as well as himself (*a*), cases in which the donee of the power has only his own interests or convenience to consult, the word “may” is plainly permissive only, and a mere privilege or license is conferred which he may exercise or not at pleasure. But an enactment that churchwardens “may” make a rate for the reimbursement of constables, or the Chancellor “may” issue a commission in a case of bankruptcy, or one conferring power on the Courts to direct that a person entitled to costs should recover them, is no mere permission to do such acts, with a corresponding liberty to abstain from doing them. A duty is at the same time cast upon the persons empowered. For these are cases where a power is deposited with public officers, for the purpose of being used for the benefit of persons having rights in the matter. So whenever a statute confers an authority to do a judicial act in a certain case, it is imperative on those so authorised to exercise the authority when the case arises, and its exercise is duly applied for by a party interested and having a right to make the application; and the exercise depends, not on the discretion of the Courts or judges, but upon proof of the particular case out of which the power arises (*b*). If a statute empowered

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Brockback v. Whitehaven</i> R. Co., 7 H. & N. 834.</p> <p>(<i>b</i>) <i>McDougal v. Paterson</i>, 11 C. B. 755. In some cases, this</p> | <p>rule seems to have been overlooked, and the word “may” construed as simply permissive. See <i>ex. gr. R. v. Eye</i>, 4 B. &</p> |
|--|--|

justices to adjudicate in certain cases, that is, to impose a certain penalty on persons whom they should find guilty of a certain offence, it is incontestable that they would have no option to decline jurisdiction because the statute used only the word "may" instead of "shall." There would be here such a right in the public as to make it the duty of the justices to exercise the power. Whether the language was facultative only or mandatory, it would be equally obligatory on them to hear and determine the complaint, to decide, one way or the other, whether the accused was guilty, and to impose the penalty if he was (*a*). The Supreme Court of the United States similarly laid it down that what public officers are empowered to do for a third person, the law requires shall be done whenever the public interest or individual rights call for the exercise of the power; since the latter is given not for their benefit, but for his, and is placed with the depositary to meet the demands of right and prevent the failure of justice. In all such cases, the Court observed, the intent of the Legislature, which is the test, is, not to devolve a mere discretion, but to impose a positive and absolute duty (*b*).

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Ald. 271, <i>Jones v. Harrison</i>, 6 Ex. 328; <i>Bell v. Crane</i>, L. R. 8 Q. B. 481; <i>R v South Weald</i>, 5 B. & S. 391; <i>De Beauvoir v. Welch</i>, 7 B. & C. 266. See also <i>R. v. Norfolk</i>, 4 B. & Ad. 238.</p> | <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Per</i> Lord Blackburn in <i>Julius v. Bp. of Oxford</i>, 5 App. Cas. 244. <i>R. v. Cumberland</i>, 4 A. & E. 695.</p> <p>(<i>b</i>) <i>Supervisors v. U. S.</i>, 4 Wallace, 446. See 52 & 53</p> |
|--|--|

Nor is the power made less imperative in any such cases by express references to the discretion of the authorised person. The duty of issuing a summons (*a*), or of examining the churchwarden's accounts (*b*), was as obligatory under the statute which empowered the justices to issue it or to examine them, "if they should so think fit," as it would have been if this expression had been omitted. Where the judgment creditor of a company "might" have execution against any individual shareholder of it, if he failed after due diligence to obtain satisfaction of his debt from the company, it was held by the Common Pleas that there was no discretion to withhold this remedy from him in any case in which the Court was satisfied that the specific facts indicated by the statute existed—viz., that the debt was unpaid, that due endeavours had been made, and had failed, to put in force the execution against the company (*c*), and, it may be added, that the creditor had done nothing to disentitle him to execution against the shareholder (*d*); although the

Vict. c. 63, s. 32, which provides that, in future, when an Act confers a power or imposes a duty, the power may be exercised, and the duty shall be performed from time to time as the occasion requires, and by the holder for the time being of the office on which the power is conferred or the duty imposed.

(*a*) *R. v. Adamson*, sup., p. 335.

(*b*) *R. v. Cambridge*, sup., p. 335.

(*c*) 7 & 8 Vict. c. 110; *Morisse v. British Bank*, 1 C. B. N. S. 67; *Hill v. London & Co. Insur. Co.*, 1 H. & N. 398. *Comp. Shrimpton v. Sidmouth*, etc., R. Co., L. R. 3 C. P. 80. decided on the 8 & 9 Vict. c. 16.

(*d*) *Scott v. Uxbridge R. Co.*, etc., L. R. 1 C. P. 596.

statute not only directed that the leave of the Court was to be asked for the execution, but provided that it "should be lawful" for the Court to grant or refuse the application for it, and "to make such order as it might see fit." Another familiar instance may be found in the case of a distress warrant to enforce a poor rate. It is well known that in every case where certain specific facts are proved, viz., that a rate, valid on its face, was made by a competent authority, that the rated land is in the district and in the occupation of the defaulter, and that the latter has been summoned and has not paid, the justices have no option to refuse the warrant, though the statute says only that they "may" issue it "if they think fit" (a). In all such cases they must exercise the power; they must "think fit" to do so whenever the occasion for it has arisen. In America, where it was enacted that city councils "might, if deemed advisable" (b), or even "might, if they believed that the public good and the best interests of the city required it" (c), levy a special tax to be expended in the liquidation of their debts, the Supreme Court issued a mandamus to levy the tax where it was proved that a debt existed, and that there were no other means in possession or pros-

(a) *R. v. Finnis*, 28 L. J. M. C. 201; *R. v. Boteler*, 33 L. J. M. C. 101. See also *R. v. Cambridge*, and *R. v. Adamson*, sup., p. 335.

(b) *Supervisors v. U. S.*, 4 Wallace, 446.

(c) *Galena v. Amy*, 5 Wallace, 705.

pect for their payment ; holding that the discretion of the town councils was limited by their duty, and could not, consistently with the rules of law (*a*), “be resolved in the negative.”

It is important here to notice the distinction between a discretion to exercise a power, and a discretion to determine only whether the occasion for it has arisen. This is illustrated by the construction of the enactment that justices may, if they think fit, issue a summons upon an information laid before them. Here the power is so far discretionary, that they may grant or refuse the summons according as they judge, in the honest exercise of their discretion (*b*), that a *prima facie* credible case is shown for it ; but its exercise is imperative, in the sense that they are bound to form an opinion, and if their opinion is that such a case is shown, it is not competent to them to refuse to exercise it on extraneous grounds, such as that the prosecution is unadvisable (*c*). An arbitrary or capricious exercise of a discretion would be no exercise at all (*d*). In the case of the annuity (*e*), the power, though couched in enabling terms only, would have been clearly

(*a*) Adverting to *R. v. Barlow*,
sup., p. 335.

(*b*) See sup., p. 172.

(*c*) *R. v. Adamson*, 1 Q. B. D.
201 ; *R. v. Fawcett*, 11 Cox,
305.

(*d*) *Per Lopes L.J.* in *R. v.*
London (Bp.), 24 Q. B. D. 243 ;
and *per Lord Esher M.R.*, *R.*

v. St. Pancras, 24 Q. B. D. 375.

(*e*) *Barber v. Gamson*, sup.,
p. 339.

imperative, if its exercise had depended only on the fact whether the whole consideration had been paid or not; but as the statute was construed to require the further fact that the retention or return of part of the consideration had been done with a corrupt or fraudulent motive, the power was so far discretionary, as the finding of this particular fact was entrusted to, and, indeed, could be determined only by the judicial discretion of the Court. It could hardly be contended that if the Court had found that the motive was corrupt, it would still have been at liberty to abstain from cancelling the deed. So, as regards the power to order the examination of witnesses abroad (*a*), the power was discretionary, not because the language was merely enabling, but because the Legislature did not intend that the power should be exercised where injustice would result; and the decision of the Court that no such consequence was likely to ensue was a fact essential to make the exercise of the power a duty. So, in the Bishop of Oxford's Case, though the power was widely discretionary as regards the question whether the occasion for its exercise arose, the Bishop could not have declined to hear the complaint (*b*); nor, if his own judicial discretion, uninfluenced by considerations foreign to his duty, had decided that the

(*a*) *Castelli v. Groom*, sup., App. 241; and see *per Lindley* p. 339. L.J. in *R. v. London (Bp.)*, 24

(*b*) *Per Lord Blackburn*, 5 Q. B. D. 240.

occasion for it had arisen, could he, consistently with the intention of the Legislature, have refused to issue the commission (*a*).

An omission which the context shows with reasonable certainty to have been unintended may be supplied, at least in enactments which are construed beneficially, as distinguished from strictly. Thus, when the 33rd section of the Fines and Recoveries Act (3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 74), in providing that if the protector of a settlement should be (1) a lunatic, or (2) convicted of felony, or (3) an infant, the Court of Chancery should be the protector in lieu of the lunatic or the infant, omitted the case of the convict of felony, it was held by Lord Lyndhurst that the omission might be supplied, in order to give effect to the manifest intention. Without it, the mention of the case of felony, in the first part of the sentence, was insensible, and it necessarily implied the missing words (*b*). Although no original limit of time is specially mentioned in the Public Health Act, 1875, within which an umpire must make his award, yet inasmuch as there is an express provision that the time for making an award by an umpire under the

(*a*) See the concluding remarks of Lord Justice Bramwell's judgment in 4 Q. B. D. 555. *v. Topham*, 3 East, 115; *Dent v. Clayton*, 33 L. J. Ch. 503; *Wilson v. Wilson*, 5 H. L. C. 40; and in wills, *Greenwood v. Greenwood*, L. R. 5 Ch. D. 954; *Re Redfern*, 6 Ch. D. 133.

(*b*) *Re Wainewright*, 1 Phil. 258. See also in deeds, *Spyve*

Act shall not in any case be extended beyond two months from the reference to him, a provision which implies the existence of an original limit, it has been held that by analogy to the original limit fixed in the case of arbitrators, an original limit of twenty-one days from the date of the reference to him must be inferred to have been fixed in his case also (*a*). So, where a statute enacted that suits "against" an association should be brought in the district where it was established, without making any provision for suits "by" the association; but an earlier Act had in a similar clause provided for suits both by and against; the Supreme Court of the United States held that the omission was accidental, and might be supplied (*b*). The 6th section of Lord Tenterden's Act furnishes another example of clerical neglect which was treated in the same spirit. It enacts that no action shall be brought in respect of a representation made by one person concerning the conduct or credit of another, to the intent that the latter "may obtain credit, goods, or money upon," . . . unless the representation was in writing. The text is clearly imperfect. Lord Abinger, while deeming any conjectural transposition of the words inadmissible, held that the word "upon" must be

(*a*) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55, s. 180, sub-s. 9; *Yeadon Loc. Bd. v. Yeadon Waterworks*, 41 Ch. D. 52. (*b*) *Kennedy v. Gibson*, 8 Wallace, 498. *Comp. Hancock v. Lablache*, 3 C. P. D. 197.

rejected as nonsensical ; but Baron Parke considered that the Court was at liberty either, by transposition, to read the passage “may obtain goods or money on “credit,” or to interpolate after “upon” the words “such representations” (a).

The reference in the Intestates Act, 1890, s. 6, to the “testamentary” expenses of an intestate, being obviously a slip in drafting, has been read as referring to the expenses of obtaining letters of administration and of administration generally (b).

In statutes governed by the principle of strict construction, such emendations have been refused (c).

Clerical errors may be read as amended ; as where, for instance, an Act refers to another by title and date, and mistakes the latter (d).

It has been asserted that no modification of the language of a statute is ever allowable in construction except to avoid an absurdity which appears to be so, not to the mind of the expositor merely, but to that of the Legislature ; that is, when it takes the form of a repugnancy (e). In this case, the Legislature shows

(a) *Lyde v. Barnard*, 1 M. & W. 101, 115 ; see also *United Alkali Co. v. Simpson*, per Lord Coleridge C.J., [1894] 2 Q. B. 121.

(b) 53 & 54 Vict. c. 29, s. 6 ; *Re Twigg's Estate*, [1892] 1 Ch. 579.

(c) See *Underhill v. Long-*

ridge, etc., inf., p. 383.

(d) 2 Inst. 290 ; *Anon. Skinn.* 110 ; *R. v. Wilcock*, 7 Q. B. 317 ; *Re Boothroyd*, 15 M. & W. 1.

(e) *Per Willes J. in Motteram v. E. C. R. Co.*, 7 C. B. N. S. 58 ; in *Bell Cox v. Hakes*, 15 App. Cas. 506, Lord Field,

in one passage that it did not mean what its words signify in another; and a modification is therefore called for, and sanctioned beforehand, as it were, by the author. But the authorities do not appear to support this restricted view. They would seem rather to establish that the judicial interpreter may deal with careless and inaccurate words and phrases in the same spirit as a critic deals with an obscure or corrupt text, when satisfied, on solid grounds (*a*), from the context or history of the enactment, or from the injustice, inconvenience, or absurdity of the consequences to which it would lead, that the language thus treated does not really express the intention, and that his amendment probably does.

SECTION II.—EQUITABLE CONSTRUCTION.

The practice of modifying the language, and controlling the operation of enactments, however, was formerly carried to still greater lengths. It used to be laid down that a remedial statute should receive an equitable construction; so that cases out of its letter should, if within the general object or mischief of the Act, be brought within the remedy which it provided (*b*). The extremely wide construction given to

accepting Willes J.'s dictum, adds "absurdity;" *Abel v. Lee*, L. R. 6 C. P. 365; *Christopherson v. Lotinga*, 15 C. B. N. S. 809; *per Brett J. in Boon v. Howard*, L. R. 9 C. P. 305.

(*a*) *Comp. Green v. Wood*, sup., pp. 25-6, and cases cited, pp. 21-2.

(*b*) *Co. Litt.* 24b; *Bac. Ab. Statute* (I.) 6; *Com. Dig. Parliament*, R. 13.

the expression "charitable" use or trust in the 43 Eliz. c. 4, is a remarkable example of this construction; the Court of Chancery including in that phrase a number of subjects which undoubtedly no one outside the Court of Chancery would have supposed to be comprehended within it (*a*).

It is to be observed, indeed, that the expression "equitable" is often used in the older authorities in a different sense. Lord Mansfield said that equity was synonymous with the intention of the Legislature (*b*); and in this sense an equitable construction is free from objection. Thus the "equitable" construction, which included uses within the statute De donis, though that enactment spoke only of "lands and tenements," and may have originally contemplated only common law estates (*c*), and which applied the 2 Hen. V. c. 3 (requiring that a juror should have "lands" worth forty shillings), to the cestui que use, and not to the feoffee, when the legal estate was in the latter (*d*), would seem to fall within the now recognised ordinary rules of construction. The 4 Ed. III. c. 7, which gave executors an action against trespassers for a wrong done to their testator, was said to have given them also an action on the case, by "the equity" of the statute (*e*); but the

(*a*) *Per* Lord Halsbury L.C.
in *Income Tax Commrs. v.*
Pemsel, [1891] A. C. 542.

(*b*) *R. v. Williams*, 1 W. Bl. 93.

(*c*) *Corbet's Case*, 1 Rep. 88.

(*d*) *Co. Litt.* 272b.

(*e*) *Russell v. Prat*, 1 Leon.

193.

decision was strictly on the letter of the Act. It turned on the construction of the word "trespass," which was held to mean a wrong done generally, and of "trespassers," which was held to mean wrongdoers (*a*). The decision that the Statute of Gloucester, c. 5 (which gives the action of waste against lessees for life, or "for years," to recover the wasted place and treble damages), reached "by equity" a tenant for one year and even for half a year, was apparently of a similar character (*b*). So, when it is said that it is on "the equity," or "equitable construction" of the statute 2 W. & M. c. 5 (which empowers a landlord to sell for the best price the goods which he has distrained for arrears of rent, if the tenant does not replevy in five days), that an action lies against the landlord who sells before the expiration of five days, though after impounding (*c*), or after a tender of the rent and expenses within that time (*d*), or for less than the best

(*a*) *Per* Lord Ellenborough in *Wilson v. Knubley*, 7 East, 133. It was held to extend to all torts except those relating to the testator's freehold, or where the injury was of a purely personal nature. See *Williams v. Cary*, 4 Mod. 403, 12 Mod. 71; *Berwick v. Andrews*, 2 Lord Raym. 971; *Bradshaw v. Lanc. & York. R. Co.*, L. R. 10 C. P. 189; *Leggatt v. Gt. Northern R. Co.*,

1 Q. B. D. 599. See *per* Bramwell L.J. in *Twycross v. Grant*, 4 C. P. D. 40.

(*b*) Co. Litt. 53a; 2 Inst. 302.

(*c*) *Wallace v. King*, 1 H. Bl. 13. See also *Pitt v. Shew*, 4 B. & A. 208; *Harper v. Taswell*, 6 C. & P. 166.

(*d*) *Johnson v. Upham*, 2 E. & E. 250. See *R. v. Cox*, 2 Burr. 785; *R. v. Younger*, 5 T. R. 449.

price (a), no more seems to have been intended than that a cause of action was given by implication (b) against the landlord who thus abused the power of sale thereby conferred on him.

But the expression has been more generally used in other senses. In the construction of old statutes, it has been understood as extending to general cases the application of an enactment which, literally, was limited to a special case. Thus, the Statute of Westminster 1 (3 Ed. I. c. 4), which enacted that a vessel should not be adjudged a wreck, if a man, a dog, or a cat escaped from it, was regarded as exempting a vessel from such adjudication, by an equitable construction, if any other animal escaped, those named being put only for example (c). The 46th chapter of the same statute, which directed the judges of the King's Bench to hear their causes in due order, was extended, on the same principle, to the judges of the other Courts (d); and the Statute of Westminster 2, c. 31, which gave the bill of exceptions to the ruling of the judges of the Common Pleas, was similarly held applicable, not only to the other judges of the Superior Courts, but to those of the County Courts, the Hundred, and the Courts Baron; their judges being still more likely to err (e). The 5 Hen. IV. c. 10, which forbade justices

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (a) Com. Dig. Distress (D.) | (c) 2 Inst. 167, 5 Rep. 107. |
| 8. | (d) 2 Inst. 256. |
| (b) See Chapter XII, Sec. | (e) 2 Inst. 426; Strother v. |
| II. | Hutchinson, 4 Bing. N. C. 83. |

of the peace to commit to any other than the common jail, was held to be equally imperative on all other judicial functionaries (*a*). The statute of 1 Rich. II. c. 12, which forbade the Warden of the Fleet to suffer his prisoners for judgment debts to go at large, until they had satisfied their debts, was held to include all jailors (*b*). The Statute of Gloucester (6 Ed. I.), c. 11, in speaking of London, was considered as intending to include all cities and boroughs equally; the capital having been named alone for excellency (*c*). The statute, or writ of *circumspecte agatis* (13 Ed. I.), which directs the judges not to interfere with the Bishop of Norwich or his clergy in spiritual suits, was construed as protecting all other prelates and ecclesiastics, the Bishop of Norwich being put but for an example (*d*).

This kind of construction, which would not be tolerated now (*e*), was said to have been given to ancient statutes in consequence of the conciseness with which they were drawn (*f*); though the specific expressions used can hardly be considered more concise than the more abstract terms for which they were, possibly, substituted. It has been explained, also, on the ground that language was used with no great precision in early times, and that Acts were framed in

(*a*) 2 Inst. 43.

v. Salomons, 7 Ex. 475.

(*b*) *Platt v. Lock*, Plowd. 35.

(*f*) 2 Inst. 401; 10 Rep.

(*c*) 2 Inst. 322.

30b; *per* Lord Brougham in

(*d*) *Id.* 487.

Gwynne v. Burnell, 6 Bing. N.

(*e*) *Per* Pollock C.B. in *Miller*

C. 561.

harmony with the lax method of interpretation contemporaneously prevalent (*a*). It has also been accounted for by the fact that in those times the dividing line between the legislative and judicial functions was feebly drawn, and the importance of the separation imperfectly understood (*b*). The ancient practice of having the statutes drawn by the judges from the petitions of the Commons and the answers of the King (*c*) may also account for the latitude of their interpretation. The judges would be disposed to construe the language with freedom, knowing, like Chief Justice Hengham and Lord Nottingham, what they meant when framing them (*d*).

But an equitable construction has been applied also to more modern statutes, and in a sense departing still more widely from the language. Thus, although the 3rd section of the 21 Jac. c. 16, enacted that certain actions should be brought within six years after the cause of action accrued, "and not after," it was nevertheless held, notwithstanding these negative terms, that where an action was brought within six years, but abated by the death of either party, a reasonable time—that is, a year, computed, not from the death, but from the grant of administration—was to be granted by an equitable construction of the statute

(*a*) *Per* Lord Ellenborough in *Wilson v. Knubley*, 7 East, 134. See *per* Lord Selborne in *Bradlaugh v. Clarke*, 8 App. Cas. 363.

(*c*) Co. Litt. 272a; *sup.*, 56.

(*b*) Sedg. Interp. Stat. 311.

(*d*) *Supra*, p. 36.

beyond the period given, to bring a fresh action by or against the personal representatives of the deceased (*a*).

The provision of the Statute of Frauds, which prohibits the enforcement of agreements for the purchase of lands, unless they be in writing, was held not to prevent the Court of Chancery from decreeing the specific performance of such agreements, though not in writing, where they had been partly performed by the party seeking to enforce the contract. On all questions on that statute, it was said, the end and purport for which it was made—namely, to prevent frauds and perjuries—was to be considered; and any agreement in which there was no danger of either, was considered as out of the statute (*b*). The statute was not made to protect or be the means of fraud (*c*); and as it would be a fraud on one of the parties if a partly-performed contract were not completely performed, the Court of Chancery compelled its performance

(*a*) *Hodsden v. Harridge*, 2 : (*c*) *Per* Lord Mansfield in *Wms. Saund.* 64a; *Curlewis v. Carter v. Boehm*, 3 Burr. 1918; *Mornington*, 7 E. & B. 283; *per* Turner L.J. in *Lincoln v. Swindell v. Bulkeley*, 18 Q. B. Wright, 4 De G. & J. 16; D. 250. See also *Piggott v. Haigh v. Kaye*, L. R. 7 Ch. Rush, 4 A. & E. 912; *Atkinson v. Bradford Bldg. Soc.*, 25 : 469; *Williams v. Evans*, L. R. Q. B. D. 377; *Re Tidd*, [1893] 5 Ch. D. 887; *Re Duke of Marlborough*, [1894] 2 Ch. 133. 3 Ch. 154.

(*b*) *Per* Lord Hardwicke in *Atty.-Gen. v. Day*, 1 Ves. senr. 221. But see *per* Lord Selborne L.C. in *Maddison v. Alderson*, 8 App. Cas. 474.

in contradiction to the positive enactment of the statute (*a*). This doctrine, however, which was said by Eyre, C.B., to have raised the very mischief which the statute intended to prevent (*b*), and which would probably have found no more favour at a later period in equity (*c*), was never recognised by the Courts of common law (*d*).

Similar considerations affected the construction which was put upon the Register Act, 7 Anne, c. 20, which, after reciting that frauds were committed by means of secret conveyances, enacted that deeds and wills affecting lands, either at law or in equity, should be adjudged fraudulent and void against subsequent purchasers, unless a memorial of them were registered. It was nevertheless held that such instruments, though unregistered, were valid against subsequent purchasers who had notice of them (*e*). It has been doubted

- (*a*) *Per* Lord Redesdale in 10 Q. B. D. 148; *Britain v. Ros-*
Bond v. Hopkins, 1 Sch. & Lef. siter, 11 Q. B. D. 123; *McManus*
 433. See also *Atty.-Gen. v. Day* v. Cooke, 35 Ch. D. 681.
 1 Ves. senr. 221; *Lester v. Fox-*
croft, Colles, 108, and 1 White & (*b*) *O'Reilly v. Thompson*, 2
Tudor's Eq. Ca. 881, where the Cox Eq. Ca. 273.
 later authorities are collected; 2 (*c*) See ex. gr. *Hughes v.*
Story Eq. Jur. s. 752 et seq.; *Morris*, 2 De G. M. & G. 349.
Webster v. Webster, 27 L. J. (*d*) *Boydell v. Drummond*,
 Ch. 115; *Wilson v. West Hartle-* 11 East, 142, 159; *Cocking v.*
pool Co., 2 De G. J. & S. 475; *Ward*, 1 C. B. 858.
Nunn v. Fabian, L. R. 1 Ch. 35. (*e*) *Le Neve v. Le Neve*,
 See *Alderson v. Maddison*, 8 App. Amb. 436; *Davis v. Strathmore*,
 Cas. 467; *Humphreys v. Green*, 16 Ves. 419; *Willis v. Brown*,
 10 Sim. 127.

whether the efficacy of the Act was not materially impaired by such a departure from its letter (*a*).

On similar grounds, it would seem, although the various Acts of Parliament which created stocks since the beginning of the reign of George I. provided that no method of assigning or transferring the stock, except that provided by the Act, should be valid or available in law, and directed that the owner of stock might devise it by will, attested by two witnesses, it was established by repeated decisions that, notwithstanding such express terms, stock might be disposed of by an unattested will ; it being held that, if not valid as a devise, the will nevertheless bound the executor as a direction for the disposition of the stock (*b*).

This principle of equitable construction has, however, fallen into discredit. It was condemned, indeed, by Lord Bacon, who declared that non est interpretatio, sed divinatio, quæ recedit a literâ (*c*) ; Lord Tenterden lamented it (*d*), and pronounced it dangerous (*e*) ; and it may now be considered as altogether discarded as regards the construction of most modern statutes (*f*). Statutes are now to be considered as framed with a view to equitable as well as legal

(*a*) *Per* Sir W. Grant in *Wyatt v. Barwell*, 19 Ves. 439 ; and see *Doe v. Allsop*, 5 B. & Ald. 142.

(*b*) *Ripley v. Waterworth*, 7 Ves. 440 ; *Franklin v. Bank of England*, 1 Russ. 589.

(*c*) *Adv. of Learning*.

(*d*) *R. v. Turvey*, 2 B. & Ald. 520.

(*e*) *Brandling v. Barrington*, 6 B. & C. 475.

(*f*) See *per* Jessel M.R. in *Exp. Walton*, 17 Ch. D. 750.

doctrines (*a*). For instance, the fact that an execution creditor had notice, when his debt was contracted, that his debtor had given a bill of sale to another person which was not registered, was held not to prevent the execution creditor from availing himself of the non-registration (*b*).

Where, indeed, a modern statute is strictly (*c*) in *pari materia* with one which has already received an equitable construction, that construction is extended to it on the general principle that they form together one body of law, and are to be construed together (*d*). Thus, the 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 42, s. 3, which limits the time for bringing actions on bonds and other specialties to twenty years, in language identical with that used in the 21 Jac. c. 16, s. 3, respecting simple contract debts, received the same equitable construction as had been given to the last-named Act; and the administrator of the obligor of a bond which had been put in suit in 1831, in which year the action abated by the death of the obligor, was held to be liable to be sued in 1858, within a year from the grant of letters of administration (*e*).

It may not be out of place to mention here that the expression "the equity of a statute" is sometimes

(*a*) *Per* James L.J. and Melish L.J., 2 Ch. D. 296, 297. of Bristol, 2 A. & E. 389.

(*b*) *Edwards v. Edwards*, 2 Ch. D. 291. (*d*) *Sup.*, 40 et seq.

(*e*) *Sturgis v. Darrell*, 4 H. & N. 622.

(*c*) *Comp. Adam v. Inhabts.*

used as meaning the principle or ground of a rule adopted from analogy to a statute. For instance, the 6 Rich. II., which provided that a writ should abate, if the declaration showed that the contract sued upon was made in a different county from that mentioned in the writ, is said to have led, by the equity of that statute, or the analogy which it furnished, to the introduction, by the judges, in the reign of James I., of the practice of changing the venue on motion, where there was no variance between the writ and declaration as to the place where the cause of action arose (*a*).

It was formerly asserted that a statute contrary to natural equity or reason (such as one which made a man a judge in his own case), or contrary to Magna Charta, was void ; for, it was said, *jures naturæ sunt immutabilia* ; they are *leges legum* ; and an Act of Parliament can do no wrong (*b*). But such dicta cannot be supported. They stand as a beacon to be avoided, rather than as an authority to be followed (*c*).

The law on this subject cannot be better laid down than in the following words of a great American

(*a*) Knight *v.* Farnaby, 2 Salk. 670 ; Craffe *v.* Boite, 1 42 Ed. III. c. 1, Co. Litt. 81a. Saund. 247 ; Tidd. Pr. c. 24. As to taking away the Royal

(*b*) Bonham's Case, 8 Rep. 118a ; City of London *v.* Wood, 12 Mod. 687 ; Day *v.* Savadge, 3 State Trials, 1235.

Hob. 87 ; Mercers Co. *v.* Bowker, 1 Stra. 639 ; 3 Inst. 111. So (*c*) See *per* Willes J. in Lee *v.* Bude R. Co., L. R. 6 C. P. 582.

authority : " It is a principle in the English law that an Act of Parliament, delivered in clear and intelligible terms, cannot be questioned, or its authority controlled, in any court of justice. ' It is,' says Sir W. Blackstone, ' the exercise of the highest authority that ' the kingdom acknowledges upon earth.' When it is said in the books that a statute contrary to natural equity and reason, or repugnant, or impossible to be performed, is void, the cases are understood to mean that the Courts are to give the statute a reasonable construction. They will not readily presume, out of respect and duty to the lawgiver, that any very unjust or absurd consequence was within the contemplation of the law. But if it should happen to be too palpable in its direction to admit of but one construction, there is no doubt, in the English law, as to the binding efficacy of the statute. The will of the Legislature is the supreme law of the land, and demands perfect obedience.

" But while we admit this conclusion of the English law, we cannot but admire the intrepidity and powerful sense of justice which led Lord Coke, when Chief Justice of the King's Bench, to declare, as he did in *Doctor Bonham's Case*, that the Common Law doth control Acts of Parliament, and adjudges them void when against common right and reason. The same sense of justice and freedom of opinion led Lord Chief Justice Hobart, in *Day v. Savadge*, to insist that an Act of Parliament made against

natural equity, as to make a man judge in his own case, was void; and induced Lord Chief Justice Holt to say, in the case of the City of London *v.* Wood, that the observation of Lord Coke was not extravagant, but was a very reasonable and true saying. Perhaps what Lord Coke said in his reports on this point may have been one of the many things that King James alluded to, when he said that in Coke's reports there were many dangerous conceits of his own uttered for law, to the prejudice of the Crown, Parliament, and subjects" (a).

(a) 1 Kent Comm. 447.

CHAPTER X.

SECTION I.—CONSTRUCTION OF PENAL LAWS.

THE rule which requires that penal and some other statutes shall be construed strictly was more rigorously applied in former times, when the number of capital offences was very large (*a*); when it was still punishable with death to cut down a cherry-tree in an orchard, or to be seen for a month in the company of gipsies (*b*), or for a soldier or sailor to beg and wander without a pass. But it has lost much of its force and importance in recent times, since it has become more and more generally recognised that the paramount duty of the judicial

| | |
|---|---|
| (a) "Previous to the Revolution, the number in the Statute Book is said not to have exceeded 50. During the reign of George II., 63 new ones were added. In 1770 the number was estimated in Parliament at 154 (Cavendish Debates ii. 12), but by Blackstone (Comm. iv. 18) at 160; and Romilly, in a | "pamphlet which he wrote in 1786 (observations on a late publication entitled 'Thoughts on Executive Government,' London), observed that in the sixteen years since the appearance of Blackstone's Commentaries it had considerably increased." Lecky, History of England, vi. 246. (b) 4 Bl. Comm. 4. |
|---|---|

interpreter is to put upon the language of the Legislature, honestly and faithfully, its plain and rational meaning, and to promote its object. It was founded, however, on the tenderness of the law for the rights of individuals, and on the sound principle that it is for the Legislature, not the Court, to define a crime and ordain its punishment (*a*). It is unquestionably a reasonable expectation that, when the former intends the infliction of suffering, or an encroachment on natural liberty or rights, or the grant of exceptional exemptions, powers, and privileges, it will not leave its intention to be gathered by mere doubtful inference, or convey it in "cloudy and dark words" only (*b*), but will manifest it with reasonable clearness. The rule of strict construction does not, indeed, require or sanction that suspicious scrutiny of the words, or those hostile conclusions from their ambiguity or from what is left unexpressed, which characterise the judicial interpretation of affidavits in support of *ex parte* applications (*c*), or of magistrates' convictions, where the ambiguity goes to the jurisdiction (*d*). Nor does it allow the imposition of a restricted meaning on the words, wherever

(*a*) *U. S. v. Wiltberger*, 5 Ad. 551; *R. v. Jones*, 12 A. & E. 684; *per Coleridge J. in R.*
Wheat. 95.

(*b*) 4 Inst. 332.

(*c*) See *ex. gr. Perks v. Severn*, Cur. in *Lindsay v. Leigh*, 11 Q. B. 465; *R. v. Stainforth*, Id. 75; *Fletcher v. Calthrop*, 6 Q. B. 880.

(*d*) See *R. v. Davis*, 5 B. &

any doubt can be suggested, for the purpose of withdrawing from the operation of the statute a case which falls both within its scope and the fair sense of its language. This would be to defeat, not to promote, the object of the Legislature (*a*); to misread the statute and misunderstand its purpose (*b*). A Court is not at liberty to put limitations on general words which are not called for by the sense, or the objects, or the mischiefs of the enactment (*c*); and no construction is admissible which would sanction an evasion of an Act (*d*). But the rule of strict construction requires that the language shall be so construed that no cases shall be held to fall within it which do not fall both within the reasonable meaning of its terms and within the spirit and scope of the enactment (*e*). To determine that a case is within the intention of a statute, its language

(*a*) Bac. Ab. Stat. (I.) 9; R. v. Hodnett, 1 T. R. 101.

(*b*) *Per* Martin B. in *Nicholson v. Fields*, 31 L. J. Ex. 236, and Bramwell B. in *Foley v. Fletcher*, 3 H. & N. 781.

(*c*) U. S. v. Coombs, 12 Peters, 80.

(*d*) Com. Dig. Parl. (R.) 28; Bac. Ab. Stat. (I.) 9; Britton v. Ward, 2 Rol. 127. *Per* Cur. in U. S. v. Wiltberger, 5 Wheat. 95; U. S. v. Gooding, 12 Wheat.

460; *American Fur Co. v. U. S.*, 2 Peters, 367; U. S. v. Coombs, 12 Peters, 80; U. S. v. Hartwell, 6 Wallace, 395.

(*e*) *Per* Best C.J. in *Fletcher v. Sondes*, 3 Bing. 580; *Bracy's Case*, 1 Salk. 348; R. v. Harvey, 1 Wils. 164; *Dawes v. Painter*, Freem. K. B. 175; *Scott v. Pacquet*, L. R. 1 P. C. 552; *Ellis v. M'Cormick*, L. R. 4 Q. B. 271; *The Gauntlett*, L. R. 4 P. C. 191, *per* James L.J.

must authorise the Court to say so; but it is not admissible to carry the principle that a case which is within the mischief of a statute is within its provisions, so far as to punish a crime not specified in the statute, because it is of equal atrocity or of a kindred character with those which are enumerated (a). If the Legislature has not used words sufficiently comprehensive to include within its prohibition all the cases which fall within the mischief intended to be prevented, it is not competent to a Court to extend them (b). It is immaterial, for this purpose, whether the proceeding prescribed for the enforcement of the penal law be criminal or civil (c).

The degree of strictness applied to the construction of a penal statute depended in great measure on the severity of the statute. When it merely imposed a pecuniary penalty, it was construed less strictly than where the rule was invoked in *favorem vitæ*. Formerly, an indictment for the capital felony of assaulting a person at a certain time and place, and feloniously cutting or feloniously robbing him, was fatally bad, because it did not allege that the cutting

(a) *U. S. v. Wiltberger*, 5 2 M. & W. 236; *Nicholson v. Wheat*. 96. *Fields*, 7 H. & N. 810; *Fletcher*

(b) *Per Lord Tenterden in v. Hudson*, 7 Q. B. D. 611; *Proctor v. Manwaring*, 3 B. & The *Bolina*, 1 Gallison, 83, *per Story J.*
A. 145.

(c) *Henderson v. Sherborne*,

or the robbing was done "then and there;" while a similar omission in an indictment for the misdemeanour of a common assault was considered immaterial (*a*). Lord Hale mentions that a statute of Edward VI., which made the stealing of horses, in the plural, a capital offence, gave rise to a doubt, which it was thought necessary to remove by enactment in the following session of Parliament, whether it included the theft of one horse only; the doubt resting on the slender foundation that an earlier Act spoke of stealing "any horse," in the singular number (*b*). Perhaps the same spirit may be found in the more modern decisions, that a Court was not bound to know that a colt was a horse, in an Act against horse-stealing (*c*); or that a pig was a "hog" in an Act against hog-stealing (*d*); and that an enactment which made it a felony to "stab, cut, or wound," did not reach the case of biting off a nose or a finger, because the injury thus inflicted was not caused by an instrument (*e*); nor that of

(*a*) 2 Hale, 178; *R. v. Baude*, Comp. R. *v. Welland*, R. & R. Cro. Jac. 41; *R. v. Francis*, 2 494.
Stra. 1015. See *R. v. Thomas*, (*d*) U. S. *v. McLain*, 2 Brev. L. R. 2 C. C. 141. 443 (Tennessee).

(*b*) 2 Hale, 365; 1 Ed. VI. c. 12. Comp. R. *v. Rowlands*, 8 C. 409; *R. v. Harris*, 7 C. & Q. B. D. 530, as to defrauding P. 446; *R. v. Jeans*, 1 C. & K. "creditors" when one only is 539. Comp. R. *v. Shadbolt*, 5 defrauded. C. & P. 504; *R. v. Elmsly*, 2

(*c*) *R. v. Beany*, R. & R. 416. Lew. 126; *R. v. Waltham*, 3

breaking a collar-bone, when the skin was not also broken (*a*).

A strict construction requires, at least, that no case shall fall within a penal statute which does not comprise all the elements which, whether morally material or not, are in fact made to constitute the offence as defined by the statute. Thus, the Coventry Act, 22 & 23 Car. II., which made capital the infliction, with malice aforethought "and by lying in "wait," of a variety of disfiguring or disabling bodily injuries, was held not to include any such outrage, however malicious and deliberate, when not preceded by a lying-in-wait with the intent of committing it (*b*). And it was much doubted whether a person who inflicted such injuries with intent to murder, and not merely to maim and disfigure, fell within the Act (*c*). If a pirate attacks a vessel, but, instead of taking her, extorts from her master a promise to pay a sum for her redemption, no piracy would be committed, for there was no taking (*d*). The Riot Act, which makes it felony for rioters to remain assembled for more than an hour after the proclamation set forth in the Act has been made, failed of effect if

Cox, 442; R. v. Owens, 1 Moo. C. C. 205.

(*a*) R. v. Wood, 4 C. & P. 381.

(*b*) 1 East, P. C. 398; R. v. Child, 4 C. & P. 442. Comp. sup., 283-4.

(*c*) So held *per* Lord King and Yates J. in R. v. Coke, 1 East, P. C. 400; *dubit.* Willes J. and Eyre B. See also R. v. Williams, Id. 424.

(*d*) Molloy, 64, s. 18.

the proclamation was not made fully and accurately ; as if, for example, the final words, "God save the "King," were omitted (a). A person cannot be convicted of perjury if the oath was administered by one who had not legal authority to administer it, as in the case of an affidavit in the Admiralty sworn before a Master in Chancery, though the Admiralty was in the habit of admitting affidavits so sworn (b). The statute which imposes a penalty where sacks of coal upon being weighed shall be found deficient in weight of coal, and prescribes that, in the weighing, the sacks are to be weighed both with and without the coals therein, is not complied with by putting the full sacks successively into one scale, and an empty sack with the weights which the coal in each should weigh in the other, and so the penalty is not recoverable in such a case (c).

An enactment which made it a misdemeanour on the part of a bankrupt to commit certain acts within four months next before "the presentation of a "bankruptcy petition against him," did not have that effect where the petition was presented by the bankrupt himself (d). An Act which made it penal to

(a) *R. v. Child*, 4 C. & P. 442. *M. & W.* 798 ; *Smith v. Wood*,
See *R. v. Woolcock*, 5 C. & P. 516. 24 Q. B. D. 23.

(b) *R. v. Stone*, 23 L. J. M. (d) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 62, s.
C. 14. 11 ; *Re Burden*, 21 Q. B. D.

(c) 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. lxxvi. 24. But see now 53 & 54 Vict.
s. 57 ; *Meredith v. Holman*, 16 c. 71, s. 26.

personate "any person entitled to vote" would not be violated by personating a dead voter (*a*). It would be different if the offence were personating a person "supposed to be entitled to vote" (*b*). A penalty imposed on a man who ran away, leaving his wife and children chargeable, or whereby they became chargeable, would not be incurred by his simple desertion, without the intent that his family should become chargeable to the parish (*c*). Nor is the husband liable to conviction for refusing to maintain his wife, when she refuses to live with him, though her refusal was owing to his ill-treatment (*d*). A gamekeeper who kills wild rabbits which it was his duty to protect, in his master's woods, and takes them away at once and sells them, is not guilty of embezzling them, for he did not get possession of them "for or on account of" his master (*e*). A statute which imposed a penalty on an unqualified person who, either in his own or another's name, did any act appertaining to the office of proctor for fee or reward, would not apply to mere agents, or to acts which, though usually performed by proctors, were not of strict right incident to their office; such as

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Whiteley v. Chappell</i>, L. R. 4 Q. B. 147. See also <i>R. v. Brown</i>, 2 East, P. C. 1007.</p> <p>(<i>b</i>) <i>R. v. Martin</i>, R. & R. 324.</p> <p>(<i>c</i>) <i>Reeve v. Yeates</i>, 1 H. & C. 435; <i>Sweeney v. Spooner</i>, 3</p> | <p>B. & S. 329. See also <i>Heath v. Heape</i>, 26 L. J. M. C. 49.</p> <p>(<i>d</i>) <i>Flannigan v. Bishop Wearmouth</i>, 8 E. & B. 451. See <i>Pape v. Pape</i>, 20 Q. B. D. 76.</p> <p>(<i>e</i>) <i>R. v. Read</i>, 3 Q. B. D. 131.</p> |
|--|---|

preparing the documents necessary for obtaining letters of administration, where there was no contest (*a*). An Act which punishes the obtaining of any "chattel, money, or valuable security" by a false pretence is not violated by obtaining "credit on "account," by a false pretence (*b*); nor by obtaining a dog by a false pretence, for a dog is not a chattel, the subject of larceny (*c*). An agent entrusted with money to invest on mortgage is not liable to conviction for embezzling it, as entrusted to him "for "safe custody" (*d*). The forging of an indorsement on a document in the form of a bill of exchange, but having no drawer's name thereon, would not be a forging of an indorsement on a bill of exchange (*e*).

Obtaining from the correspondent of a banker a sum of money on a cheque drawn in favour of the correspondent on the banker, on whom the drawer falsely pretended he had authority to draw, would not be an attempt to obtain money from the banker by false pretences. If the correspondent were to

(*a*) 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, 23 & 24 Vict. c. 127; *Stephenson v. Higginson*, 3 H. L. C. 638; *Law Soc. v. Shaw*, 9 Q. B. D. 1.

(*b*) *R. v. Wavell*, 1 Moo. C. C. 224.

(*c*) *R. v. Robinson*, 28 L. J. M. C. 58. But "chattels" includes choses in action, such as shares in a joint-stock company,

Robinson v. Jenkins, 24 Q. B. D. 275; and a dog may be "goods," *R. v. Slade*, 21 Q. B. D. 433.

(*d*) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96, s. 76; *R. v. Newman*, 8 Q. B. D. 706.

(*e*) *R. v. Harper*, 7 Q. B. D. 78. *Comp. R. v. Bowerman*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 112.

obtain the money from the banker, it would not be obtained by the authority of the drawer of the cheque; nor, presumably, by his wish, for he would gain nothing by it (*a*). The provision of the Sheriffs Act, 1887, which imposes a penalty on any sheriff's officer who "takes or demands any money or "reward under any pretext whatever," other than the fees or sums allowed by that or any other Act, would not apply to a claim for charges disallowed on taxation; as the claim must be taken to have been a demand for such items of the charges as should be allowed on taxation (*b*). Moreover, the penalty is inflicted for the doing of an act in the nature of a criminal offence, and to constitute such an offence there must be a *mens rea*, and consequently, he is not liable to a penalty for a mere mistake (*c*).

The Act which punishes the administration of a noxious drug would not include a substance which is not in itself poisonous but noxious only when given in excess, as cantharides (*d*). A provision which prohibits unloading coal across a footway does not apply to coke (*e*).

It was held that the Act which imposes a penalty

(*a*) *R. v. Garrett*, Dears. 233.

(*d*) *R. v. Hennah*, 13 Cox.

(*b*) 50 & 51 Vict. c. 55, s. 547.

29 (2) b; *Woolford's Trustee v.*
Levy, [1892] 1 Q. B. 772.

(*e*) 30 & 31 Vict. c. 134, s. 5;
Fletcher v. Fields, [1891] 1 Q.

(*c*) *Lee v. Dangar*, [1892] 2
Q. B. 337.

for "baiting" animals did not apply to setting dogs in pursuit of rabbits in a small enclosed space of three or four acres, from which the rabbits could not escape; the word "baiting" being, if not etymologically, at least popularly, confined to attacks on animals tied to a stake (a). So it has been held that a person is not guilty of "frequenting" a street with intent to commit a felony, in the absence of evidence that he had been there more than once (b). An article kept ready for use in a back room or cellar is not "exposed for sale" within the Margarine Act, 1887 (c). A person found on premises for an immoral purpose involving no breach of the criminal law does not fall under the penalty imposed for being found on premises "for an unlawful purpose" (d). Nor would a man who obtained a license to retail beer, by means of a certificate that he was "a person of good character," be liable to conviction for using a certifi-

(a) *Pitts v. Millar*, L. R. 9 c. 194, s. 20; and *Greig v. Benden*, supra, p. 62.

(b) 5 Geo. IV. c. 83, s. 4; (c) 50 & 51 Vict. c. 29, s. 6; *Clark v. R.*, 14 Q. B. D. 92. *Crane v. Lawrence*, 25 Q. B. D. 152. *Comp. Wheat v. Brown*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 418. And see *Barlow v. Terrett*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 107.

(d) 5 Geo. IV. c. 83; *Hayes v. Stevenson*, 3 L. T. N. S. Q. B. 296. And see *Pointon v. Hill*, 12 Q. B. D. 306, as to "wandering abroad to beg and gather alms" within s. 3 of same Act. Also *Apothecaries' Co. v. Jones*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 89, as to "acting or practising" as an apothecary within 55 Geo. III.

cate which he knew to be false, merely because he cohabited with a woman without being married to her (a).

The Metropolis Local Management Act of 1862, in incorporating the powers for the "suppression" of nuisances, conferred by an earlier local Act, which contained, besides several provisions for getting rid of existing nuisances, a prohibition against keeping pigs, was held not to have comprised this last provision, as the effect of it was, not to "suppress," but to prevent the creation of nuisances (b). Where an Act, after providing, by one section, that any building, built or rebuilt, except on the site of a former dwelling, should not be "used" as a dwelling, unless there was an open space of twenty feet in front of it, without the previous consent of the local board, imposed, by another, a penalty if any building or work were "made or suffered to continue" contrary to the provisions of the Act; the Court refused to construe the latter section as including the offences prohibited in the former, though the effect of the decision was to leave them without specific provision for their punishment (c).

On the ground that an enactment giving a power

(a) *Leader v. Yell*, 16 C. B. R. 7 Q. B. 550.
N. S. 584.

(b) *Chelsea Vestry v. King*, C. 921; diss. Martin B. See
17 C. B. N. S. 625. See Great another example in *Elliott v.*
Western R. Co. v. Bishop, L. Majendie, L. R. 7 Q. B. 429.

of committal for non-payment of a debt is a highly penal one, it was held that s. 5, sub-s. 2 of the Debtors Act, 1869, which gives such a power in the case of default made by any person in payment of any "debt due from him" in pursuance of a judgment, did not apply to the case of a judgment debt with execution limited to the separate property of a married woman, which could not properly be described as a "debt due from her," upon the strict construction which such a section required (*a*). And it has been held that a garnishee order absolute is not a "final judgment" against the garnishee within s. 4, sub-s. 1 (g) of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883; for the words "final judgment" have a proper professional meaning, and when found in a section of an Act which is defining acts of bankruptcy should be construed as strictly as if they occurred in a section defining a misdemeanour, because the commission of an act of bankruptcy entails disabilities on the person who commits them (*b*).

Again, as illustrative of the rule of strict construction, it has been said that while remedial laws may extend to new things not in esse at the time of

(*a*) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 62; *Chinery*, 12 Q. B. D. 342. *Scott v. Morley*, 20 Q. B. D. 120. See also *Re Gardiner*, 20 Q. B. D. 249. And see *Exp. Schmitz*, 12 Q. B. D. 511; *Exp. Whinney*, 13 Q. B. D. 476.

(*b*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 52; *Exp.*

making the statute (*a*), penal laws may not. Thus, the 31 Eliz. c. 12, which took away the benefit of clergy from accessories after, as well as before the fact, was held not to extend to accessories made by subsequent enactment. The receiver, therefore, of a stolen horse, who was made an accessory by a later statute, was held not ousted (*b*). Where one Act (24 & 25 Vict. c. 96, s. 91) made it felony to receive with guilty knowledge a chattel, the stealing of which was felony either at common law or under that Act; and a subsequent one (31 & 32 Vict. c. 116) made a partner who stole partnership property liable to conviction for the stealing, as though he had not been a partner; it was held that to receive such stolen property was not an offence under the earlier Act (*c*).

The Stock Jobbing Act, which, after referring, in the preamble, to the great inconveniences which had arisen, and daily arose by the wicked practice of stock jobbing—diverting men from their ordinary pursuits, ruining families, discouraging industry, and injuring commerce—declared void all such contracts “in any “public or joint stock, or other public securities “whatsoever,” was held, notwithstanding the mischief in view, and the wide terms used, not to apply to transactions in foreign funds (*d*) or in railway

(*a*) 2 Inst. 35; *per* Cur. in
Dawes v. Painter, Freem. K. B.

175. Sup., p. 109.

(*b*) Fost. Cr. L. 372

(*c*) R. v. Smith, L. R. 1 C. C.
266.

(*d*) 7 Geo. II. c. 8, repealed
by 23 & 24 Vict. c. 28; Hender-

shares (*a*), on the ground that the former were not dealt in, and the latter were not known, in England, when the Act was passed.

But this degree of strictness may be regarded as extreme. It could hardly be contended that printing a treasonable pamphlet was not an offence against the statute of Edw. III., because printing was not invented until a century after it was passed; or that it would not be treason to shoot the Queen with a pistol, or poison her with an American drug (*b*). The 55 Geo. III. c. 58, s. 2, which enacts that no brewer or dealer in beer shall have, or put into beer, any liquor for darkening its colour, or use molasses or any preparation in lieu of malt and hops, under a penalty of £200, was held not to be confined to such dealers as were known at the time when the Act was passed, viz., licensed victuallers, licensed by a magistrate under the Act of 5 & 6 Edw. VI. c. 25; but to include the retailer of beer furnished with an excise license, who first came into legal existence under the 1 Will. IV. c. 64 (*c*). So the statute 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 32, s. 18, authorising justices to license any householder to sell game, who is not licensed to sell beer by retail, includes not

son *v.* Bise, 3 Stark. 158; Wells Gr. 355.

v. Porter, 2 Bing. N. C. 722. (*b*) Hallam, Const. Hist. c. Comp. Smith *v.* Lindo, 5 C. B. 15.

N. S. 587.

(*c*) Atty.-Gen. *v.* Lockwood,

(*a*) Hewitt *v.* Price, 4 M. & 9 M. & W. 378.

only householders licensed under the Excise Act, 1 Will. IV. c. 64, but also those who hold an "additional" license under the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 33, s. 1 (*a*). The 8 Anne, c. 7, which enacted that if any sort of prohibited goods should be landed without payment of duty, the offender should forfeit treble value, was held to extend to gloves, which were not prohibited until the 6 Geo. III. (*b*). A market Act which prohibited the sale of provisions in any part of the town but the market-place, would extend to parts of the town built after the Act was passed on what were then fields (*c*).

It was held that the 8 Geo. II. c. 13, which imposed a penalty for piratically engraving, etching, or otherwise, or "in any other manner," copying prints and engravings, applied to copying by photography, though that process was not invented till more than a century after the Act was passed (*d*). Bicycles were held to be carriages within the provision of the Highway Act against furious driving, and tricycles propelled by steam to be locomotives within the Locomotive Act of 1865, though not invented when those Acts were passed (*e*). Under an Act which imposed a penalty

- | | |
|--|--|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Shoolbred v. St. Pancras</i> | <i>Faversham</i> , 10 B. & S. 548n. |
| J.J., 24 Q. B. D. 346. | (<i>d</i>) <i>Gambart v. Ball</i> , 14 C. B. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Atty.-Gen. v. Sagers</i> , 1 | N. S. 306; <i>Graves v. Ashford</i> , |
| Pri. 182. | L. C. 2 C. P. 410. |
| (<i>c</i>) <i>Collier v. Worth</i> , 1 Ex. | (<i>e</i>) <i>Taylor v. Goodwin</i> , 4 |
| D. 464. See <i>R. v. Cottle</i> , 16 | Q. B. D. 228; <i>Parkyn v.</i> |
| Q. B. 412, and <i>Milton v.</i> | <i>Preist</i> , 7 Q. B. D. 313. |

for selling bread otherwise than by weight, except bread "usually sold" under the denomination of fancy bread, it was held penal to sell bread which would have fallen within the exception at the time when the Act was passed, but which had since ceased to be sold under the denomination of fancy bread (*a*).

The general principle in question is well exemplified by comparing the manner in which an omission which, it was inferable from the text, was the result of accident, has been generally dealt with in penal and in remedial Acts. Thus, where the owner of mines was required, under a penalty, in case (1) of loss of life in the mine by accident, or (2) of personal injury arising from explosion, to send notice of such accident to an inspector within twenty-four hours "from the loss of "life" (omitting the case of personal injury), the Court refused to supply, in order to make the defendant liable to a conviction, the obvious omission in the latter branch of the sentence, and held that notice was not necessary when personal injury from explosion, short of loss of life, had occurred; although the mention of such injury in the earlier part of the sentence was idle and insensible without such an interpolation (*b*). The 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 63, s. 28, which

(*a*) *R. v. Wood*, L. R. 4 Q. B. 559. *Comp. Aerated Bread Co. v. Gregg*, L. R. 8 Q. B. 355.

(*b*) *Underhill v. Longridge*, 29 L. J. M. C. 65. *Comp. Williams v. Evans*, 1 Ex. D. 277, cited *inf.*, p. 395.

empowered inspectors to examine "weights, measures, and scales," in shops, and if upon examination it appeared that "the said weights or measures" (omitting scales) were light or unjust, to seize them, was held not to authorise a seizure of scales (a). The Municipal Corporations Act of William IV., after empowering the borough justices to appoint a clerk to the justices, provided that it should not be lawful to appoint to that office any alderman or councillor, and provided that the clerk should not prosecute any offender committed for trial, enacted that any person "being an alderman or "councillor" who should act as clerk to the justices, or "shall otherwise offend in the premises," should forfeit £100, recoverable by action. This clearly did not reach a clerk who prosecuted offenders committed by the justices, if he was not an alderman or councillor; and yet the manifest intention seemed to be that he should be subject to the penalty for either or both offences, of acting if disqualified, and of prosecuting. But to effectuate this intention, it would have been necessary to interpolate the words "any person who" before "shall otherwise offend"; and this the Court refused to do for the purpose of bringing a person within the penal enactment (b); though also relieving him from indictment (c). So, the Court

(a) *Thomas v. Stephenson*,
2 E. & B. 108.

(b) *Coe v. Lawrence*, 1 E. &
B. 516.

(c) *Per Coleridge J.* See also
R. v. Davis, L. R. 1 C. C. 272.
See *Exp. National Merc. Bank*,
15 Ch. D. 42, sup., p. 23.

refused to supply a *casus omissus* under the Vaccination Act of 1871, as it was an enactment creating an offence (*a*). If the statutes, in these cases, had been remedial, the omission would probably have been supplied (*b*).

The rule of strict construction, however, whenever invoked, comes attended with qualifications and other rules no less important; and it is by the light which each contributes that the meaning must be determined (*c*). Among them is the rule that that sense of the words is to be adopted which best harmonises with the context, and promotes in the fullest manner the policy and object of the Legislature. The paramount object, in construing penal as well as other statutes, is to ascertain the legislative intent; and the rule of strict construction is not violated by permitting the words to have their full meaning, or the more extensive of two meanings, when best effectuating the intention (*d*). They are, indeed, frequently taken in the widest sense, sometimes even in a sense more wide than etymologically belongs or is popularly attached to them, in order to carry out effectually the legislative intent, or, to use Lord Coke's words, to suppress the mischief and advance the remedy (*e*).

(*a*) *Broadhead v. Holdsworth*,
2 Ex. D. 321.

(*b*) *Re Wainwright*, 1 Phil.
258, sup., p. 351.

(*c*) *Per Cur. in U. S. v.*
Hartwell, 6 Wallace, 395.

(*d*) *Id.* 396.

(*e*) *Heydon's Case*, 3 Rep. 7b.

Thus, the Act which makes it felony to set fire to or damage a ship or vessel has been construed as including an open boat of eighteen feet in length (*a*). Under the statute which makes it a misdemeanour knowingly to utter counterfeit coin is included a genuine coin from which the milling has been filed and replaced by another (*b*). Although the Act which punishes a man for running away from his wife and "children," thereby leaving them chargeable to the parish, applies only to the desertion of legitimate children, this rests, not on any indisposition to depart from the strict and narrow meaning of the word, but on the ground that the object of the Legislature was limited to the enforcement of the man's legal obligation, which did not extend to the support of his illegitimate children (*c*). But the statute which made it a criminal offence to take an unmarried girl from the possession and against the will of her father or mother, was held to apply to the case of a natural daughter taken from her putative father (*d*); for the wider construction obviously carried out more fully the aim and policy of the enactment. The "taking from the possession" again, in the same enactment, is construed in the widest sense, implying

(*a*) *Semble per Patteson J.* S. 58; *Westminster v. Gerrard*, in *R. v. Bowyer*, 4 C. & P. 559; 2 Bulst. 346.

see *Re Fergusson*, L. R. 6 Q. B. 280; *sup.*, 100. (*d*) 4 & 5 Ph. & M. c. 8; *R. v. Cornforth*, 2 Stra. 1162;

(*b*) *R. v. Hermann*, 4 Q. B. D. 284. see 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 55; and see *R. v. Hodnett*, 1 T. R. 96.

(*c*) *R. v. Maude*, 2 Dowl. N. 96.

neither actual nor constructive force, and extending to voluntary and temporary elopements made with the active concurrence of the girl (*a*).

Lord Coke thought that burglary might be committed in a church, because a church is the mansion of God; but Lord Hale thought this opinion only a quaint turn without any argument (*b*). The "breaking" required to constitute burglary includes acts which would not be so designed in popular language; such as lifting the flap of a cellar (*c*), or pulling down the sash of a window (*d*), or raising a latch (*e*), or even descending a chimney, for that is as much closed as the nature of things permits (*f*). Lord Hale, who doubted whether the latter act was a breaking, was relieved from deciding the point in the case before him, as it was elicited that some bricks had been loosened in the thief's descent, which sufficed to constitute a breaking (*g*). Indeed, the burglar "breaks" into a house if he gets admittance by inducing the

(*a*) *R. v. Robins*, 1 C. & K. C. 487; *R. v. Russell*, 1 Moo. 456; *R. v. Kipps*, 4 Cox, 167; C. C. 377. *Comp. R. v. Lawrence*, 4 C. & P. 231.
R. v. Biswell, 2 Cox, 279; *R. v. Manktelow*, D. & P. 159; (*d*) *R. v. Haines*, R. 2 Moo. R. v. Timmins, 30 L. J. M. 451.
 C. 45. (*e*) *R. v. Jordan*, 7 C. P. 432.

(*b*) 1 Hale, 556. See *Folkestone Corp. v. Woodward*, L. R. 15 Eq. 159; *Wright v. Ingle*, 16 Q. B. D. 379. (*f*) 1 Hawk. c. 38, s. 4; *R. v. Brice*, R. & R. 450.
 (*g*) 1 Hale, 552.

(*c*) *Brown's Case*, 2 East, P.

inmate to open the door by a trick, as by a pretence of business, or by raising an alarm of fire (*a*).

A threatening letter is "sent" when it is dropped in the way of the person for whom it is destined, so that he may pick it up (*b*); or is affixed in some place where he would be likely to see it (*c*); or is placed on a public road near his house, so that it may, however indirectly, reach him, which it eventually does after passing through several hands (*d*); or perhaps even if it does not reach the person addressed (*e*); although in none of these cases would the paper be popularly said to have been "sent." A person who writes and publishes an article in a newspaper, intending to encourage the murder of another person anywhere, is guilty of encouraging a person to murder, though the article is not addressed to any particular person (*f*).

To make false signals, and thereby to bring a train to a stand on a railway, was held to be within the enactment which made it an offence to "obstruct" a railway (*g*); and an enactment which makes it a misdemeanour to do anything to obstruct an engine

(*a*) 2 East, P. C. 485.

(*e*) *R. v. Adams*, 22 Q. B. D. 66.

(*b*) *R. v. Jepson*, and *R. v. Lloyd*, 2 East, P. C. 1115, 1122; *R. v. Wagstaff*, R. & R. 398.

(*f*) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 4; *R. v. Most*, 7 Q. B. D. 244.

(*c*) *R. v. Williams*, 1 Cox, 16.

(*g*) *R. v. Hadfield*, L. R. 1 C. C. 253; *R. v. Hardy*, Id.

(*d*) *R. v. Grimwade*, 1 Den. 30; and see *R. v. Jones*, 5 Cox, 226.

278. *Comp. Walker v. Horner*, 1 Q. B. D. 4. See *Gully v. Smith*, 12 Q. B. D. 121.

or carriage using a railway, was held to include railways not yet open to public traffic, and to apply, though no engine or carriage was obstructed (*a*).

A person "suffers" gaming to go on in his house who purposely abstains from ascertaining, or purposely goes out of reach of seeing or hearing it (*b*); and he uses an instrument for the destruction of game on a Sunday, who sets a snare on Saturday, and leaves it till Monday (*c*).

An Act which made it penal to "administer," or "to cause to be taken," a noxious drug, to procure abortion, would be violated by one who supplied such a drug to a woman, and explained to her how it was to be taken, and she afterwards took it accordingly, in his absence (*d*). And a man supplies such a drug, "knowing it to be intended" to procure abortion, if he so intended it, though the woman did not (*e*). To supply beer at a public-house to a drunken man would be to "sell" the liquor to him, although it was ordered and paid for by a sober companion (*f*).

(*a*) *R. v. Bradford*, Bell, 268. 5 Q. B. 336. See also *Ruther*

(*b*) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94, s. *v. Harris*, 1 Ex. D. 97.

17; *Redgate v. Haynes*, 1 Q. B. (*d*) *R. v. Wilson*, D. & B. D. 89. See *Bond v. Evans*, 21 127; *R. v. Farrow*, D. & B. 164.

Q. B. D. 249; and compare (*e*) *R. v. Hillman*, L. & C. *Somerset v. Hart*, 12 Q. B. D. 343. *Comp. R. v. Fretwell*, L. & C. 161.

[1894] 1 Q. B. 574; *Massey v.* (*f*) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94, s. *Morris*, [1894] 2 Q. B. 412. 13; *Scatchard v. Johnson*, 57

(*c*) *Allen v. Thompson*, L. R. L. J. M. C. 41.

An Act which prohibited under a penalty "the copying of a painting" without the owner's leave was held to reach a photograph of an engraving which the proprietor of the painting had made from it (*a*).

A servant receives money "for or in the name or "on account of his master" within the Act against embezzlement, who, having a cheque given to him in his own name for his master, gets it cashed by a person ignorant of the circumstances; for though that person did not pay the money on account of the master, it was enough that it was received on his account (*b*). The Adulteration Act, 1875, which makes it penal to sell an adulterated article "to the prejudice of the "purchaser," would include a sale to an officer who makes the purchase, not with his own money or for his own use, but with the public money and for the purpose of analysis (*c*).

A man who fires from a highway at game, has trespassed on the land of the owner of the soil on which the highway runs; for the right of way over the road is only an easement, and if a man uses it for an unlawful purpose, he becomes a trespasser (*d*). If he walks with a gun with intent to kill game, he "uses" the gun for that purpose without firing, within the

(*a*) Exp. Beal, L. R. 3 Q. B. 387.

(*b*) R. v. Gale, 2 Q. B. D. 141.

(*c*) Hoyle v. Hitchman, 4 Q. B. D. 233.

(*d*) Mayhew v. Wardley, 14 C. B. N. S. 550; R. v. Pratt, 4 E. & B. 860; Harrison v. Rutland (Duke), [1893] 1 Q. B. 142.

statute which makes using a gun with that intent penal (*a*); and the offence of "taking" game is complete when the game is snared, though neither killed nor removed (*b*). A "public place," too, has received a very wide meaning in cases of nuisance (*c*).

A person who pays for goods by a cheque on a bank where he has no assets is guilty of "obtaining goods "by false pretences;" for in giving the cheque he impliedly represents that he has authority from the bank to draw it, and that it is a good and valid order for payment of the amount (*d*). So, in promising to give £100 on the signature of a note, there is a representation of an existing fact, viz., that the money was ready on the delivery of the note (*e*).

An Act which imposed a penalty on corn-dealers for omitting to make a return of every parcel of corn bought from them would be broken, though the unreturned sales were not evidenced in writing as required by the Statute of Frauds, and therefore were not enforceable in a Court of Justice (*f*).

The enactment which punished with transportation

(*a*) 5 Anne, c. 14, s. 4; *R. v. Langrishe v. Archer*, 10 Q. B. King, 1 Sess. Ca. 88; see 1 & D. 44.

2 Will. IV. c. 32, s. 23; see also (*d*) *R. v. Hazelton*, L. R. 2 U. S. v. Morris, 14 Peters, 464. C. C. 134; *R. v. Parker*, 7 C.

(*b*) 5 Geo. III. c. 14; *R. v. & P. 829.*
Glover, R. & R. 269. (*e*) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96, s. 90;

(*c*) See *R. v. Thallman*, L. R. v. Gordon, 23 Q. B. D. 354.

& C. 326. See *Golding v. (f) R. v. Townrow*, 1 B. & Stocking, L. R. 4 Q. B. 516; Ad. 465.

for life every person, whether employed by the Postmaster-General, or by "any person under him, or on behalf of the post-office," who stole a letter with money in it, was held to include a person who gratuitously assisted a postmaster, at his request, in sorting the letters (*a*). The Bankrupt Act of 1849, which disentitled a bankrupt to his certificate, if he had, within a year of his bankruptcy, lost £200 by "any contract" for the purchase or sale of Government or other "stock," was held to apply to one who had lost that amount in the purchase of railway "shares," and by several contracts (*b*). The employment of an English steam tug in towing a prize to the captor's waters is a breach of the provision of the Foreign Enlistment Act of 1870, against "dispatching a ship to be employed in the military or naval service of a foreign state" (*c*). Where an Act (7 Vict. c. 15) provided that if any accident occurred in a factory, causing an injury to any person employed there, of such a nature as to prevent his return to work at 9 a.m. on the next day, it must, under a penalty, be reported by the occupier of the factory to the district surgeon and the sub-inspector; it was held that the Act applied to all accidents, whether caused by the machinery of the factory or

- (*a*) *R. v. Reason*, D. & P. 226; (*b*) *Exp. Copeland*, 22 L. J. R. v. Foulkes, L. R. 2 C. C. Bey. 17.
 150. *Comp. Martin v. Ford*, 5 (*c*) *Dyke v. Elliott*, L. R. 4
 T. R. 101, and *Bennett v. Edwards*, 6th point, 7 B. & C. 586.

otherwise; and that the sufferer was prevented from returning to work next day, within the meaning of the Act, although he did return for that purpose, but was unable to work (*a*).

The Corrupt Practices Prevention Act of 1854, which declares that whoever, "directly or indirectly," makes a gift to a person to induce him to "endeavour "to procure the return" of any person to Parliament shall be deemed guilty of bribery, was held to extend to a gift made to induce its recipient to vote for the giver at a preliminary test ballot, held for the purpose of selecting one of three candidates to be proposed when the election came. In voting for the giver at the test ballot, the voter indirectly "endeavoured to procure" his return at the election (*b*).

An enactment which prohibited any officer concerned in the administration of the poor laws from "supplying for his own profit" any goods "ordered" to be "given" in parochial relief to any person, was held to reach a guardian whose partner had, with knowledge of the facts, sold a bedstead to the relieving officer on behalf of the parish for delivery to a pauper; although the guardian was ignorant of the transaction, the bedstead had not been "ordered" by the guardians (*c*), and it was only lent, not

(*a*) *Lakeman v. Stephenson*,
L. R. 3 Q. B. 192.

(*c*) *Greenhow v. Parker*, 6 H.
& N. 882. See *Woolley v.*

(*b*) *Britt v. Robinson*, L. R.
5 C. P. 503. *Kay*, 1 H. & N. 307.

“given” in parochial relief (*a*). An officer of a local board, who was a shareholder in a company having a contract with the board, was held to be “interested” in a bargain or contract” with the board, within the meaning of the Public Health Act, 1875, and liable to the penalty imposed by that statute (*b*). In another case, the occupier of an enclosed ground, who admitted the public on it, on payment, to witness a foot-race and a pigeon-match, was held liable to conviction for having used the place for the purposes of betting, or having knowingly permitted it to be so used by others; as a number of professional betting men had obtained entrance and carried on their business there with his knowledge; though this was not the immediate purpose for which he had thrown the grounds open, and it did not appear that he and the betting men were in any way connected in their business, or that he derived any profit from it (*c*).

The Highway Act of Will. IV., which enacted that if any person (1) riding a horse, or (2) driving a carriage, rode or drove furiously, “every person so

- | | |
|---|--|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Davies v. Harvey</i> , L. R. 9 Q. B. 433 ; <i>Stanley v. Dodd</i> , 1 D. & R. 397. <i>Comp. Proctor v. Manwaring</i> , 3 B. & Ald. 145. | (<i>c</i>) <i>Eastwood v. Miller</i> , L. R. 9 Q. B. 440 ; <i>Haigh v. Sheffield</i> , L. R. 10 Q. B. 102 ; <i>Hornsby v. Raggett</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 20. |
| (<i>b</i>) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55, s. 193 ; <i>Todd v. Robinson</i> , 14 Q. B. D. 739 ; <i>Nutton v. Wilson</i> , 22 Q. B. D. 744. | But see <i>R. v. Cook</i> , 13 Q. B. D. 377, and <i>Snow v. Hill</i> , 14 Q. B. D. 588. |

“offending” should be liable on conviction before a magistrate to forfeit £5, if “the driver” was not the owner of the carriage, and £10 if “the driver” was the owner (not mentioning the rider), was construed as making the rider, who was not the owner of the horse, as well as the driver, liable; as providing, in other words, that while the owner of a carriage was liable to a penalty of £10, the offender in all the other cases mentioned was liable to £5 (*a*).

An Act which made it felony riotously to demolish, pull down, or destroy, or begin to demolish, pull down, or destroy a church or dwelling, would not reach a case where the demolition had not gone beyond movable shutters not attached to the freehold; for whatever might have been the intent of the rioters, this was not a beginning of the demolition of the house to which the shutters belonged (*b*); nor would a partial demolition of the building be a “beginning to demolish” within the Act, if not done with the intention of completing it (*c*). But if the structure were in all substantial respects destroyed, the offence would be included in the Act, although some portion, as, for instance, a chimney, had been

(*a*) *Williams v. Evans*, 1 Ex. 1 Ex. D. 67.

D. 277, overruling *R. v. Bacon*, 11 Cox, 540.

(*b*) *R. v. Howell*, 9 C. & P. 437; *Pilcher v. Stafford*, 4 B. & S. 775; *Eddleston v. Burnes*,

(*c*) *R. v. Thomas*, 4 C. & P. 237, *per* Littledale J.; *R. v. Price*, 5 C. & P. 510, *per* Tindal C.J.; *Drake v. Footitt*, 7 Q. B. D. 201.

suffered to remain uninjured (*a*). Nor would it be considered as beyond the operation of the Act, if the demolition had been effected by fire; although arson is a distinct felony provided for by a different enactment (*b*).

Some of the decisions relative to the theft of writings seem to convey a fair impression of the spirit in which criminal statutes have been construed. As neither land nor mere rights were capable of being stolen, it was early established that title deeds relating to lands, and written contracts, which were mere rights or the evidences of rights, were not the subjects of larceny. To steal a skin worth a shilling was felony; but when it had £10,000 added to its value by what was written on it, it was no offence at common law to take it away (*c*); and a person who broke into a house at night with the intention of stealing a mortgage deed would not have been guilty of felony, for the theft was not a felony, but a misdemeanour only (*d*). If, indeed, the document were worthless as a right, or evidence of a right, such as an unstamped cheque, the thief might be punished for stealing the piece of paper on which it was written (*e*); but if it represented a right to land or

(*a*) *R. v. Langford*, Car. & M. 602. & *R. 12*; Nunc aliter, *vide* 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96, s. 27 and

(*b*) *R. v. Harris*, and *R. v. Simpson*, C. & M. 661, 669. s. 2. (*d*) *R. v. Powell*, 21 L. J. M. C. 78.

(*c*) Arg. in *R. v. Westbeer*, 2 Stra. 1133; *R. v. Pooley*, R. (e) *R. v. Perry*, 1 Den. 69.

to an action, it lost, as regards the question of larceny, its physical character of parchment or paper.

Where the absence of a stamp did not destroy its documentary character, but only excluded it as evidence in a Court of Justice until stamped, the theft could not be treated as of a piece of paper (*a*). But a paper like a pawnbroker's ticket, indicating not a mere right of action, but a right to a specific personal chattel of which the holder of the ticket may be regarded as in possession (for the possession of the pawnor is his possession for the purpose of an indictment), would be the subject of larceny (*b*).

An Act which punished the obtaining a "valuable security" by false pretences would include a railway ticket, which is evidence of a right of being carried on the railway (*c*). But one which punished an agent who, in violation of good faith, and contrary to the purpose of his trust, sold, negotiated, transferred, pledged, or in any manner converted to his own use "any chattel or valuable security" with which he was entrusted, would not include a policy of insurance entrusted to him for collection; for it is neither a chattel capable of sale or barter, nor yet a valuable security, for this implies that money is payable irre-

(*a*) *R. v. Watts*, 1 D. & P. 326.

(*b*) *R. v. Morrison*, Bell, 158.
See *R. v. Fitchie*, 1 D. & B.
175.

(*c*) *R. v. Boulton*, 1 Den.

508; *R. v. Beecham*, 5 Cox,
181. See *Marks v. Benjamin*,
5 M. & W. 565.

spectively of any contingency ; and it is not capable of being sold, negotiated, transferred, or pledged (a).

The tendency of modern decisions, upon the whole, is to narrow materially the difference between what is called a strict and a beneficial construction. All statutes are now construed with a more strict regard to the language, and criminal statutes with a more rational regard to the aim and intention of the Legislature, than formerly. It is unquestionably right that the distinction should not be altogether erased from the judicial mind (b) ; for it is required by the spirit of our free institutions that the interpretation of all statutes should be favourable to personal liberty (c) ; and it is still preserved in a certain reluctance to supply the defects of language, or to eke out the meaning of an obscure passage by strained or doubtful inferences (d). The effect of the rule of strict construction might almost be summed up in the remark, that where an equivocal word or ambiguous sentence leaves a reasonable doubt of its meaning which the canons of interpretation fail to solve, the benefit of the doubt should be given to the subject, and against the Legislature which has failed to explain itself (e).

(a) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96, s. 75 ; Henderson v. Sherborne, 2 M. R. v. Tatlock, 2 Q. B. D. 157. & W. 239.

(b) Per Pollock C.B. in Nicholson v. Fields, 31 L. J. (d) Per Story J. in The Industry, 1 Gall. 117.

Ex. 233. (e) See Hull Dock Co. v.

(c) Per Lord Abinger in Browne, 2 B. & Ad. 59 ; per

But it yields to the paramount rule that every statute is to be expounded according to the intent of them that made it (*a*); and that all cases within the mischiefs aimed at are to be held to fall within its remedial influence (*b*).

SECTION II.—STATUTES ENCROACHING ON RIGHTS, OR IMPOSING BURDENS.

Statutes which encroach on the rights of the subject, whether as regards person or property, are similarly subject to a strict construction. It is a recognised rule that they should be interpreted, if possible, so as to respect such rights (*c*). It is presumed, where the objects of the Act do not obviously imply such an intention, that the Legislature does not desire to confiscate the property, or to encroach upon the rights of persons; and it is therefore expected that if such be its intention, it will manifest it plainly, if not

Pollock in *Nicholson v. Fields*, ubi sup.; and *per* Bramwell B. in *Foley v. Fletcher*, 28 L. J. Ex. 106; Puff. L. N. b. 5, c. 12, s. 5, Barb. n. 4; *Lewis v. Carr*, 1 Ex. D. 484.

(*a*) 4 Inst. 330, *The Sussex Peerage*, 11 Cl. & F. 143.

(*b*) *Fennell v. Ridler*, 5 B. & C. 406; *The Industry*, ubi sup.

See *ex. gr. R. v. Charretie*, 13 Q. B. 447; *Wynne v. Middleton*, 1 Wils. 126; *Archer v. James*, 2 B. & S. 61; *Smith v. Walton*, 3 C. P. D. 109; *May v. G. W. R. Co.*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 384, *per* Cockburn C.J.; *R. v. Adams*, 22 Q. B. D. 66.

(*c*) *Per* Bowen L.J. in *Hough v. Windus*, 12 Q. B. D. 224.

in express words, at least by clear implication, and beyond reasonable doubt (a). It is a proper rule of construction not to construe an Act of Parliament as interfering with or injuring persons' rights, without compensation, unless one is obliged so to construe it (b).

A local harbour Act, which imposed a penalty on "any person" who placed articles "on any quay, wharf, or landing place, within ten feet of the quay head, or on any space of ground immediately adjoining the said haven, within ten feet from high-water mark," so as to obstruct the free passage over it, was held to apply only to ground over which there was already a public right of way, but not to private property not subject to any such right, and in the occupation of the person who placed the obstruction on it (c). Notwithstanding the comprehensive nature of

- (a) *Western Counties R. Co. v. Windsor and Annapolis R. Co.*, 7 App. Cas. at p. 188; and see *per* Bramwell L.J. in *Wells v. London & Tilbury R. Co.*, 5 Ch. D. 130; *per* Mellish L.J. in *Re Lundy Co.*, L. R. 6 Ch. 467; *per* James L.J. in *Exp. Jones*, L. R. 10 Ch. 663; *per* Cur. in *Randolph v. Milman*, L. R. 4 C. P. 113; *Green v. R.*, 1 App. 513; *Exp. Sheil*, 4 Ch. D. 789; *per* Bowen L.J. in *Rendell v. Blair*, 45 Ch. D. 139; *per* Lord Esher M.R. in *Duke of Devonshire v. O'Connor*, 24 Q. B. D. 468, referring to the judgment of Cockburn C.J. in *Sowerby v. Smith*, L. R. 9 C. P. 524.
- (b) *Per* Brett M.R. in *Atty.-Gen. v. Horner*, 14 Q. B. D. 257.
- (c) *Harrod v. Worship*, 1 B. & S. 381; diss. *Wightman J.* See also *Wells v. London & Tilbury R. Co.*, 5 Ch. D. 126; *Yarmouth v. Simmons*, 10 Ch. D. 518.

the general terms used, it was not to be inferred that the Legislature contemplated such an interference with the rights of property as would have resulted from construing the words as creating a right of way. The Partnership Law Amendment Act of 1865, which provides that when a loan to a trader bore interest varying with the profits of the trade, the lender shall not, if the trader becomes bankrupt, "recover" his principal until the claims of the other creditors are satisfied, did not deprive the creditor of any rights acquired by mortgage. Though he could not recover, he was entitled to retain (a).

On this ground, it would seem, Statutes of Limitation are to be construed strictly. The defence of lapse of time against a just demand is not to be extended to cases which are not strictly within the enactment; while provisions which give exceptions to the operation of such enactments are to be construed liberally (b).

Statutes which impose pecuniary burdens, also, are subject to the rule of strict construction. It is a well settled rule of law that all charges upon the subject must be imposed by clear and unambiguous language, because in some degree they operate as penalties (c).

(a) *Exp. Sheil*, 4 Ch. D. 789. *Diamond*, 4 B. & C. 243; *per*

(b) See the judgment of Lord Park J. in *Doe v. Snaith*, 8 Bing. 152; *per* Parke B. in *Harris v. Birch*, 9 M. & W. 1 De G. & J. 1.

(c) *Per* Bayley J. in *Denn v.* 594; *Sneezum v. Marshall*, Id.

The subject is not to be taxed unless the language of the statute clearly imposes the obligation (a). A construction, for example, which would have the effect of making a person liable to pay the same tax twice in respect of the same subject matter, would not be adopted unless the words were very clear and precise to that effect (b). In a case of reasonable doubt the construction most beneficial to the subject is to be adopted (c). Thus, in estimating a bank manager's "total income" "from all sources," for the purpose of ascertaining whether he is entitled to partial relief from income tax, the yearly value of his free residence in the bank premises, where he is bound to reside, is not to be taken into account as "income" (d). The provision of s. 32 of the Inland Revenue Act, 1881, that if it shall be discovered that the personal estate of a deceased person was undervalued at the time of probate, "the person acting in the adminis-

419; *per* Field J. in *R. v. Barclay*, 8 Q. B. D. 306; *Partington v. Atty.-Gen.*, L. R. 4 H. L. 100; *Oriental Bank v. Wright*, 5 App. Cas. 842; *Inland Rev. v. Angus*, 23 Q. B. D. 519.

(a) *Per* Cur. in *Hull Dock Co. v. Browne*, 2 B. & Ad. 59; *per* Pollock C.B. in *Nicholson v. Fields*, 31 L. J. Ex. 233; *Parry v. Croydon Gas Co.*, 11 C. B. N. S. 579; 15 Id. 568.

(b) *Carr v. Towle*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 251.

(c) *Per* Lord Lyndhurst in *Stockton R. Co. v. Barrett*, 11 Cl. & F. 602; *per* Parke B. in *Re Micklethwait*, 11 Ex. 456; *per* Lindley L.J. in *Re Thorley*, [1891] 2 Ch. 613; *Pryce v. Monmouth Canal Co.*, 4 App. Cas. 197.

(d) *Tennant v. Smith*, [1892] A. C. 150.

"tration of the estate shall deliver a further affidavit
 "with an account duly stamped, with the amount of
 "excess duty which ought to have been paid in the
 "first instance," does not apply to persons who have
 completed the duties of administration (a). Where
 land employed as the site of an almshouse was, on
 that account, declared in two successive statutes to
 be exempt from land tax, the fact that other land
 had since been applied to the same charitable pur-
 pose, and the original land had been, by order of
 the Court of Chancery, directed to be held by the
 trustees of the charity to their own use, free from
 its charitable trusts, did not render it liable, even
 in the hands of a tenant, to the taxation from which
 it had been previously exempt (b). So, an Act
 which imposed a stamp on every writing given on
 the payment of money, "whereby any sum, debt,
 "or demand" was "acknowledged to have been
 "paid, settled, balanced, or otherwise discharged,"
 was held not to extend to a receipt given on the
 occasion of a sum being deposited (c). If one in-
 strument be incorporated by reference in another,
 its words would not be counted as part of the
 incorporating deed for the purpose of stamp duty,
 under an Act imposing a duty according to its
 length on the instrument, "together with every

(a) 44 & 45 Vict. c. 12, s. Cas. 473.

32; Atty.-Gen. v. Smith, [1893]
 1 Q. B. 239.

(c) Tomkins v. Ashby, 6 B.
 & C. 541. See also Wroughton

(b) Cox v. Rabbits, 3 App. v. Turtle, 11 M. & W. 561.

“schedule, receipt, or other matter put or endorsed thereon, or annexed thereto” (a). Where an Act imposed a stamp duty on newspapers, and defined a newspaper as comprising “any paper containing “public news, intelligence, or occurrences . . . to be “dispersed and made public,” and also “any paper “containing any public news, intelligence, or occurrences, or any remarks or observations thereon . . . “published periodically or in parts or numbers, at “intervals not exceeding twenty-six days,” and not exceeding a certain size; it was held that a publication, the main object of which was to give news, but was published at intervals of more than twenty-six days, was not liable to the stamp duty as a newspaper (b). An Act which imposes a stamp duty on “every charter-party, or memorandum, or other writing between the captain or “owner of a vessel and any other person, relating “to the freight or conveyance of goods on board,” does not extend to a guarantee for the due performance of a charter-party (c). And yet, where an Act, after imposing a stamp on contracts, exempted those which were made relative to the sale of goods, a guarantee for the payment of the price on such a sale was held included in the exemption (d); the same words being susceptible

(a) *Fishmongers' Co. v. Dimsdale*, 12 C. B. 557.

(b) *Atty.-Gen. v. Bradbury*, 7 Ex. 97.

(c) 5 & 6 Vict. c. 79; *Rein v. Lane*, L. R. 2 Q. B. 144.

(d) *Warrington v. Furber*, 8 East, 242.

of meaning different things when used to impose a tax, or to exonerate from it (*a*). Lord Ellenborough remarked that the cases to which a duty attached ought to be fairly marked out, and that a liberal construction ought to be given to words of exception confining the operation of the duty (*b*). It is to be observed, however, that all exemptions from taxation to some extent increase the burden on other members of the community (*c*).

At the same time, such Acts, like penal Acts, are not to be so construed as to furnish a chance of escape and a means of evasion (*d*). The Stamp Act, 1870, which imposed (s. 3 and schedule) an ad valorem duty on settlements by which "any definite and "certain amount of stock is settled," obviously applied although the interests in the stock were contingent and defeasible, where the amount of the stock was definite and certain (*e*). Indeed, as in criminal statutes, the widest meaning is given to the language when needful to effectuate the intention of the Legislature. For instance, in one of the Church Building Acts, which enacted that the

(*a*) *Per* Blackburn J., L. R. 2 Q. B. 147, citing *Curry v. Edensor*, 3 T. R. 527, and *Warrington v. Furbor*, *ubi sup.* See also *Armytage v. Williamson*, 3 App. Cas. 355.

(*b*) *Warrington v. Furbor*, 8 East, 242.

(*c*) *Per* Lord Halsbury L.C. in *Inland Rev. v. Forrest*, 15 App. Cas. 334.

(*d*) *U. S. v. Thirty-six Barrels of Wine*, 7 Blatchf. 459.

(*e*) 33 & 34 Vict. c. 97; *Onslow v. Inland Revenue*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 239.

“repairs” of district churches might be provided for by a rate on the district, the word “repairs” was construed as comprising not only reparation of the structure, but all incidental matters necessary for the due performance of service, such as lighting, cleaning, stationery, and organist’s salary (a). In America, revenue laws are not regarded as penal laws in the sense that requires them to be construed with strictness in favour of the defendant. They are regarded rather in their remedial character; as intended to prevent fraud, suppress public wrong, and promote the public good; and are so construed as to most effectually accomplish those objects (b).

It is said that all statutes which give costs are to be construed strictly, on the ground that costs are a kind of penalty (c). There is little authority in support of the proposition. On the other hand, the power of ordering the payment of costs has been sometimes construed on the principle of beneficial and liberal construction; as where, for instance, they have been imposed on persons who were strangers to an action of ejectment, but at whose instance it was brought or defended (d).

(a) *R. v. Consistory Court*, 2 Wallace, 145.

B. & S. 339. See *R. v. Warwick*, 8 Q. B. 926, sup., 97; 205. See *per Mellor J. in Cobb Atty.-Gen. v. L. & N. W. Ry.*, 6 Q. B. D. 216; *Re Thorley*, Q. B. 351.

[1891] 2 Ch. 613.

(d) *Hutchinson v. Green-*

(b) *Cliquot’s Champagne*, 3 wood, 4 E. & B. 324; *Mobbs*.

Enactments, also, which impose forms and solemnities on contracts on pain of invalidity, are construed strictly, so as to be as little restrictive as possible of the natural liberty of contracting. It was in allusion to the Statute of Frauds that Lord Nottingham said that all Acts which restrain the common law, that is, apparently, which impose restrictions unknown to the common law, ought themselves to be restrained in exposition (*a*). The Statute of Frauds, which enacts that no action shall be brought on contracts (s. 4), or that the contracts shall not be good (s. 17), unless "the agreement or some note or memorandum thereof shall be in writing and signed by the party to be charged therewith, or some other person thereunto by him lawfully authorised," has given rise to many decisions, apparently in this spirit. Thus, although it is unquestionably necessary that all the essential elements of the contract shall appear in the writing, such as the subject matter (*b*), the consideration (*c*), and the parties (*d*), it has been held that it is not necessary

v. Vandenbrande, 4 B. & S. 904. *Comp. Evans v. Rees*, 2 Q. B. 334; *Anstey v. Edwards*, 16 C. B. 212; *Hayward v. Giffard*, 4 M. & W. 194. See also *R. v. Pembridge*, 3 Q. B. 901, sup., 34.

(*a*) *Ash v. Abdy*, 3 Swanst. 664.

(*b*) *Shardlow v. Cotterell*, 20

Ch. D. 90; *Vale of Neath Colliery v. Furness*, 45 L. J. Ch. 276; *Marshall v. Berridge*, 19 Ch. D. 233.

(*c*) *Wain v. Warlters*, 5 East, 10.

(*d*) *Williams v. Lake*, 2 E. & E. 349; *Williams v. Byrnes*, 1 Moo. N. S. 154; *Williams v.*

that they should be contained in any formal document (*a*). A note or letter stating the material particulars, verbally accepted, suffices (*b*). The statute is satisfied, also, by a number of letters or other documents connected either physically, by being fastened together (*c*), or by their own internal evidence, without the aid of extrinsic evidence, if all the elements of the contract may be collected from the whole correspondence (*d*). A letter from the purchaser addressed to a third person, stating the terms of the contract (*e*), and one from the

Jordan, 6 Ch. D. 517; *Beer v. London and Paris Hotel Co.*, L. R. 20 Eq. 412. See, under the 30 Vict. c. 23, s. 7, *Re Arthur Assoc.*, L. R. 10 Ch. 542; comp. *Edwards v. Aberayron Soc.*, 1 Q. B. D. 563.

(*a*) *Gray v. Smith*, 43 Ch. D. 208.

(*b*) *Colman v. Upcot*, 5 Vin. Ab. 527, pl. 17; *Welford v. Beazley*, 3 Atk. 503; *Bill v. Bament*, 9 M. & W. 36; *Rishton v. Whatmore*, 8 Ch. D. 467; *Munday v. Asprey*, 13 Ch. D. 855; *Cave v. Hastings*, 7 Q. B. D. 125.

(*c*) *Kenworthy v. Scofield*, 2 B. & C. 945.

(*d*) *Shortrede v. Cheek*, 1 A. & E. 57; *Boydell v. Drummond*,

11 East, 142; *Dobell v. Hutchinson*, 3 A. & E. 355; *Watts v. Ainsworth*, 1 H. & C. 83; *Morris v. Wilson*, 5 Jur. N. S. 168; *Crane v. Powell*, L. R. 4 C. P. 123; *Bonnewell v. Jenkins*, 8 Ch. D. 70; *Commings v. Scott*, L. R. 20 Eq. 11; *Kronheim v. Johnson*, 7 Ch. D. 60; *Beckwith v. Talbot*, 5 Otto, 289 (U.S.). See *Ridgway v. Warton*, 6 H. L. C. 238, cited in *Jones v. Victoria Dock Co.*, 2 Q. B. D. 314; *Studds v. Watson*, 28 Ch. D. 305; *Hussey v. Horne-Payne*, 4 App. Cas. 311; *Bristol Aerated Bread Co. v. Maggs*, 44 Ch. D. 616; *Bellamy v. Debenham*, 45 Ch. D. 481.

(*e*) *Gibson v. Holland*, L. R. 1 C. P. 1. Sugd. V. & P. 139,

purchaser to the seller, which after setting forth its terms repudiated the contract, have been held sufficient notes or memoranda of the bargain to satisfy the statute (*a*). It has been said that the cases have gone very far in putting the correspondence of parties together, to constitute a memorandum to satisfy the statute (*b*). Indeed, as it becomes necessary, in such a case, to inquire what the contract really was, in order to determine whether the informal papers constitute a written note of it, it may be said that the very evil is let in against which the statute aimed (*c*).

So although it is necessary that the parties to the contract should be sufficiently described to admit of their identification (*d*), it is not necessary that they should be described by name. It has been held, for instance, that a contract of sale signed by the auctioneer, as "the agent of the proprietor," or of "the trustee for the sale" of the property sold, sufficiently described the seller (*e*); though a contract

14th ed. And see *Re Hoyle*, [1893] 1 Ch. 84.

(*a*) *Bailey v. Sweeting*, 9 C. B. N. S. 843; *Wilkinson v. Evans*, L. R. 1 C. P. 407, dubit. *Cockburn C.J.* in *Smith v. Hudson*, 34 L. J. Q. B. 149; *Buxton v. Rust*, L. R. 7 Ex. 1, 279.

(*b*) *Per Pollock C.B.* in *McLean v. Nicoll*, 7 Jur. N. S. 999.

(*c*) *Per Channell B.*, *Ibid.* See ex. gr. *Rishton v. Whatmore*, 8 Ch. D. 467.

(*d*) *Charlewood v. Bedford*, 1 Atk. 497; *Champion v. Plummer*, 1 N. R. 252; *Williams v. Lake*, 2 E. & E. 349.

(*e*) *Sale v. Lambert*, L. R. 18 Eq. 1; *Catling v. King*, 5 Ch. D. 660; *Rossiter v. Miller*, 3 App. Cas. 1124.

similarly "signed by the agent of the vendor" would not suffice (a); for a mere assertion that the person who sells is the seller, is obviously not a description of the seller, nor tends to his identification.

Again, as regards the signing or subscribing an instrument as party or witness, the enactments which require these formalities have been construed with similar indulgence. The testator who wrote his will with his own hand, and began by declaring that it was his will, setting forth his name, was deemed to have thereby sufficiently "signed" his will (b); and an attesting witness who wrote his name on the will, elsewhere than at the end of it, was deemed to have sufficiently "subscribed" it, within the Statute of Frauds (c). A letter, beginning "Messrs. H. & Co., 'Gentlemen,'" drawn up by their clerk by their authority, and presented by him to E. for signature, has been held to be sufficiently signed by a person authorised by H. & Co., so as to entitle E., who had signed it, to sue them for breach of the contract contained in the letter (d). An agreement, too, has been held to be sufficiently signed by a corporate body, within the meaning of the Statute of Frauds, where a resolution ordering its engrossment and

(a) *Potter v. Duffield*, L. R. 18 Eq. 4; *Thomas v. Brown*, 1 Q. B. D. 714.

(b) 29 Car II. c. 3, s. 5; *Lemayne v. Stanley*, 3 Lev. 1.

(c) *Roberts v. Phillips*, 4 E. & B. 450; and see the cases, *sup.*, p. 53.

(d) *Evans v. Hoare*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 593.

execution was passed by the body and signed by the chairman (*a*).

Acts which establish monopolies (*b*), or confer exceptional exemptions and privileges, correlatively trenching on general rights, are subject to the same principle of strict construction (*c*). The Act 21 Edw. I., *de malefactoribus in parcis*, which authorised a parker to kill trespassers whom he found in his park, and who refused to yield to him, was construed as strictly limited to a legal park—that is, one established by prescription or Royal Charter, and not merely one by reputation (*d*). The enactment that shipowners should not be liable for damage done by their ships without their default, beyond “the value of the ship” and its “freight,” was held to include, in this value, everything belonging to her owners that was on board for the performance of her adventure, such as the fishing stores of a vessel employed in the Greenland fishery; although they would not have been covered by a policy on “the ship and “freight,” and the phrase, “the value of the ship “and her appurtenances” had been used ten times.

(*a*) *Jones v. Victoria Dock Co.*, 2 Q. B. D. 314.

(*b*) *Per* Lord Campbell in *Reed v. Ingham*, 3 E. & B. 899; *Direct U. S. Cable Co. v. Anglo-Am. Co.*, 2 App. Cas. 394.

(*c*) See *ex. gr. R. v. Hull Dock Co.*, 3 B. & C. 516; *Brunskill v. Watson*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 418.

(*d*) 1 Hale, 491; 3 Dyer, 326b; Com. Dig. Parl. (R.) 20.

in other parts of the Act (a). This decision rested on the ground that the enactment abridged the common law right of the injured person; and that the shipowner was not entitled to more than the meaning of the words strictly imported. So, the enactments which exonerate a shipowner from liability for damage caused by his ship through the default of a compulsorily employed pilot, are restricted to cases where the pilot was the sole cause of the damage, without any default on the part of the master or crew (b).

The same principle of construction is applied to enactments which create new jurisdictions, or delegate subordinate legislative or other powers (c). As the government of India is precluded from legislating directly as to the sovereignty or dominion of the Crown over any part of its territories in India, an enactment by the Indian Legislative Council making a notification in the Gazette conclusive evidence of a cession of territory, was held inoperative to prevent a Court in India from inquiring into the nature and lawfulness of the cession (d). A general order made

- | | |
|--|--|
| (a) <i>Gale v. Laurie</i> , 5 B. & P. D. 145. | |
| C. 156; <i>Smith v. Kirby</i> , 1 Q. B. D. 131. | (c) See <i>ex. gr. per James L.J.</i> in <i>Flower v. Lloyd</i> , 6 Ch. D. 301; <i>Diss v. Aldrich</i> , 2 Q. B. D. 179. |
| (b) <i>The Protector</i> , 1 W. Rob. 45; <i>The Diana</i> , 4 Moo. P. C. 11; <i>The Iona</i> , L. R. 1 P. C. 426. <i>Comp. The Warkworth</i> , 9 | (d) <i>Damodhar v. Deoram</i> , 1 App. Cas. 332. |

by the judges of the Court of Chancery, under Parliamentary authority to regulate the procedure of that Court, and which directed how a defendant "in any "suit" might be served with process abroad, was held by Lord Westbury (*a*) limited to those suits in which service abroad had been provided for by law, viz., suits relating to land and public stock by the 2 Will. IV. c. 33, and 4 & 5 Will. IV. c. 82. If the order had been construed literally as applicable to all suits, it would, while professedly only regulating the procedure, have, in effect, extended the jurisdiction of the Court; an object foreign to the Act which conferred the power of regulation. This decision, indeed, was afterwards overruled; but it was on the ground that the jurisdiction of the Court had always existed, though there was no power of enforcing it; and that the order, therefore, did not extend the jurisdiction (*b*).

The power given to a County Court judge "in "every case, if he shall think just, to order a new "trial," is exercisable only where such reasons exist as would lead the Supreme Court to grant a new trial (*c*). And under a power to regulate the practice of their Courts, it is more than doubtful whether the

(*a*) *Cookney v. Anderson*, 1 L. R. 2 Ch. 32; *Hope v. Hope*, De G. J. & Sm. 365. See also 4 De G. M. & G. 345; and see *Lauman v. Audley*, 2 M. & W. 535; *Great Australian Co. v. Martin*, 5 Ch. D. 1; *Fowler v. Barstow*, 20 Ch. D. 240. *Re Busfield*, 32 Ch. D. 123.

(*c*) 51 & 52 Vict. c. 43, s. 93; *Murtagh v. Barry*, 24 Q. B. D. 632.

(*b*) *Drummond v. Drummond*,

County Court judges have authority to make a rule empowering a judge to appoint a deputy registrar, if the registrar is absent at the sitting of the Court (*a*). The 22 & 23 Vict. c. 21, which empowered the Barons of the Exchequer to make rules as to the process, practice, and pleading of their Court in revenue cases, was held not to authorise them to make rules granting an appeal to the Exchequer Chamber and House of Lords (*b*). A different construction would, in effect, have given the Barons authority to confer jurisdiction on two Superior Courts, and to impose on them the duty of hearing an appeal against its decisions (*c*). A power given to the Court, subject to the restrictions of the Act, to authorise the grant of leases, followed by a proviso that any person entitled to the possession of settled estates might apply to the Court for the exercise of the power, was held not exercisable except on the application of such a person (*d*). When commissioners were authorised, at the same time that they awarded compensation, to apportion the payment among those benefited, an apportionment made at a subsequent time was held invalid (*e*).

(*a*) *Wetherfield v. Nelson*, L. R. 4 C. P. 571. As to references to the official referee, *Longman v. East*, 3 C. P. D. 142.

(*b*) *Atty.-Gen. v. Sillem*, 10 H. L. C. 704. *Comp. Re Hann*, 18 Q. B. D. 393.

(*c*) *Per Lord Kingsdown*, 10 H. L. C. 775.

(*d*) *Taylor v. Taylor*, 1 Ch. D. 426, 3 Id. 145.

(*e*) *Mayor of Montreal v. Stevens*, 3 App. Cas. 605.

The Licensing Act, 1872, enacting that where justices have ordered a distress in default of payment of a penalty, they may order, in default of its payment, imprisonment for six months, was held not to authorise imprisonment where no order of distress had been made in consequence of the defendant admitting his inability to pay the fine. It would, indeed, have been idle to issue a distress; but the words were express and positive (*a*). So, where an Act gives an appeal to the next Quarter Sessions, that Court cannot, under a general power to regulate its procedure, reject it, unless the conviction or order appealed against be filed (*b*), or notices not required by the statute be given (*c*), or the appeal itself be lodged, so many days before the Sessions (*d*). It might perhaps, unless the statute required that the appeal should be decided at the same Sessions (*e*), lawfully postpone the hearing of an appeal not complying with those conditions

(*a*) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94, s. 51; *Exp. Brown*, 3 Q. B. D. 545; *per Cockburn C.J.*, *dubit.* Mellor J. See other illustrations, in the construction of the powers given to the railway commissioners, *Great Western R. Co. v. R. Com.*, 7 Q. B. D. 182; *Toomer v. London, Ch. & D. R. Co.*, 2 Ex. D. 450; *S. E. R. Co. v. R. Com.*, 6 Q. B. D. 586.

(*b*) *R. v. West Riding*, 2 Q. B. 705.

(*c*) *R. v. West Riding*, 5 B. & Ad. 667; *R. v. Norfolk*, 5 B. & Ad. 990; *R. v. Surrey*, 6 D. & L. 735; *R. v. Blues*, 5 E. & B. 291.

(*d*) *R. v. Pawlett*, L. R. 8 Q. B. 491; *R. v. Staffordshire*, 4 A. & E. 844.

(*e*) *R. v. Belton*, 11 Q. B. 388.

within such time ; but to reject it altogether would be to refuse the appellant the privilege given by the Act, by imposing conditions which the Legislature had not imposed. Where the judge of the Court of Arches was required, under the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874, to hear a cause in London or Westminster, it was held that he had no power to hear it elsewhere in the province of Canterbury, and that all his proceedings there were void (*a*).

The power given by the 43 Eliz. c. 2, to justices to appoint "four, three, or two substantial householders," as parish overseers, is not well executed by appointing more than four (*b*) ; or by appointing a single one, even when he is the only householder in the parish (*c*). The 355th section of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, which empowers the Board of Trade to give the master of a ship a certificate to pilot "any ships "belonging to the same owner," was construed as requiring that the name of the owner should be mentioned in the certificate ; and a certificate representing another person as the owner was held not granted in compliance with the statute (*d*).

(*a*) *Hudson v. Tooth*, 3 Q. B. C. P. 686, and comp. under *Trustee Act*, 1850, s. 32, *Shipperdson's*

(*b*) *R. v. Loxdale*, 1 Burr. 445 ; *Trusts*, 49 L. J. Ch. 619 ; *Stokes' Trusts*, L. R. 13 Eq. 333 ; *Harford's Trusts*, 13 Ch. D. 135 ; but

(*c*) *R. v. Cousins*, 4 B. & S. 849 ; *R. v. Clifton*, 2 East, 168. see *Re Colyer*, 50 L. J. Ch. 79.
(*d*) *The Earl of Auckland*, 30 L. J. P. M. & A. 121, 127.

Where trustees, who were authorised to borrow £30,000 for building a chapel, and to levy the amount, with interest, by a rate, borrowed £32,000, and made a rate to pay the interest on the whole of that sum, it was held, not only that they had exceeded their power, but that the rate was bad in toto (*a*).

A corporate body, constituted by statute for certain purposes, is regarded as so entirely the creature of the statute, that acts done by it without the prescribed formalities, or for objects foreign to those for which it was formed, would be, in general, null and void (*b*).

Rules and bye-laws enforceable by penalties are construed like other provisions encroaching on the ordinary rights of persons. They must, on pain of invalidity, be not unreasonable, nor in excess of the statutory power authorising them, nor repugnant to that statute or to the general principles of law (*c*).

(*a*) *Richter v. Hughes*, 2 B. Holyhead Board, 1 H. & C. 499. 601; *Fielding v. Rhyll*, 3 C. P.

(*b*) *Chambers v. Manchester*, D. 272; *Saunders v. S. E. R. Co.*, 5 Q. B. D. 456; *Dyson v.*

(*c*) See *Hacking v. Lee*, 2 E. Lond. & N. W. R., 7 Q. B. & E. 906; *Exp. Davis*, L. R. 7 D. 32; *Huffam v. N. Staffordshire R. Co.*, [1894] 2 Q. B. Ch. 526; *Bentham v. Hoyle*, 3 821; *Ashendon v. Lond. & Br. Q. B. D. 289*; *Johnson v. Croydon*, 16 Q. B. D. 708; *Dick v. R. Co.*, 5 Ex. D. 190; *Peek v. N. Staffordshire R. Co.*, 10 Q. B. D. 387. See also *Hall v. Nixon*, L. R. 10 Q. 10 H. L. C. 473; *Dickson v. B. 152*; *Young v. Edwards*, 33 G. N. R., 18 Q. B. D. 176; *L. J. M. C. 227*; *Hattersley v. Dearden v. Townsend*, L. R. 1 Burr, 4 H. & C. 523; *Brown v. Q. B. 10.*

A local Act which authorised a navigation company to make bye-laws for the orderly using of the navigation, and for the governing of the boatmen carrying merchandise on it, was held not to authorise a bye-law which closed the navigation on Sundays, and prohibited the use of any boat on it, except for going to church (*a*). Where a charter which founded a school empowered the governors to remove the master at their discretion, and also authorised them to make bye-laws; it was held that a bye-law ordaining that the master should not be removed unless sufficient cause was exhibited in writing against him, signed by the governors, and declared by them to be sufficient, was void; for the power to make bye-laws did not authorise the making of one which restrained and limited the powers originally given to the governors by the founder. This was in effect to alter the constitution of the school (*b*).

Where, however, the statute conferring the power to make bye-laws enacts that any such laws consistent with the provisions of the statute, and not repugnant

(*a*) *Calder and Hebble Nav. Co. v. Pilling*, 14 M. & W. 76. *Rose*, 5 E. & B. 49; *Bostock v. Staffordshire R. Co.*, 3 Sm. &

(*b*) *R. v. Darlington School*, 6 Q. B. 682, questioned by Lord G. E. R. Co., L. R. 10 Ch. 586; *Hatherley in Dean v. Bennett*, L. R. 6 Ch. 489. See also *R. v. Norton v. London & N. W. R. Co.*, 9 Ch. D. 623, 13 Id. 268; *Cutbush*, 4 Burr. 2204; *Chilton v. London & Croydon R. Co.*, D. 12. *Comp. Bonner v. G. W. R.*, 24 Ch. D. 1. *Williams v. G. W. R. Co.*, 10 Ex. 16; *R. v.*

to any other law in force, shall have the force of law when confirmed by the Executive, it is doubtful whether a Court would not be precluded from questioning the reasonableness of such bye-laws or whether they are *ultra vires*, unless it be in some very extreme case (*a*).

As regards enactments of a local or personal character, which confer any exceptional exemption from a common burden (*b*), or invest private persons or bodies, for their own benefit and profit, with privileges and powers interfering with the property or rights of others, they are construed against those persons or bodies more strictly, perhaps, than any other kind of enactment. Any person whose property is interfered with has a right to require that those who interfere shall comply with the letter of the enactment so far as it makes provision on his behalf (*c*). The Courts take notice that they are obtained on the petitions framed by their promoters; and in construing them, regard them, as they are in effect, contracts (*d*) between those persons, or those whom they represent, and the Legislature on behalf

(*a*) *Slattery v. Naylor*, 13 App. Cas. 446. See *Institute of Patent Agents v. Lockwood*, [1894] A. C. 347. *Herron v. Rathmines Improvement Commissioners*, [1892] A. C. 523.

(*b*) See *ex. gr. Perchard v. Heywood*, 8 T. R. 468. (*d*) See observations of Lord Selborne in *Milnes v. Mayor of Huddersfield*, 11 App. Cas.

(*c*) *Per Lord Macnaghten in* 523.

of the public and for the public good (a). Their language is therefore treated as the language of their promoters, who asked the Legislature for them; and when doubt arises as to the construction of that language, the maxim, ordinarily inapplicable to the interpretation of statutes, that *verba cartarum fortius accipiuntur contra proferentem*, or that words are to be understood most strongly against him who uses them, is justly applied. The benefit of the doubt is to be given to those who might be prejudiced by the exercise of the powers which the enactment grants, and against those who claim to exercise them (b).

(a) On this ground a contract by such a body never to use a power given by Parliament was held void. *Ayr Harbour v. Oswald*, 8 App. Cas. 623.

(b) See among many authorities, *R. v. Croke*, 1 Cowp. 26; *Gildart v. Gladstone*, 11 East, 685; *Hull Dock Co. v. La Marche*, 8 B. & C. 52; *Dudley Canal Co. v. Grazebrook*, 1 B. & Ad. 59; *Hull Dock Co. v. Browne*, 2 B. & Ad. 58; *per Patteson J. in R. v. Cumberworth*, 4 A. & E. 741; *Blakemore v. Glamorganshire Canal Co.*, 1 M. & K. 154; *Webb v. Manchester R. Co.*, 4 Myl. & C. 116; *Stockton and Darlington R. Co. v. Barrett*, 11 Cl. & F. 590; *Scales v. Pickering*, 4 Bing. 448; *Parker v. G. W. R.*, 7 M. & Gr. 253; *Eversfield v. Mid-Sussex R. Co.*, 3 De G. & J. 286; *Simpson v. S. Staffordshire Waterworks*, 34 L. J. Ch. 380; *R. v. Wycombe*, L. R. 2 Q. B. 310; *Morgan v. Metropolitan R. Co.*, L. R. 4 C. P. 97; *Fenwick v. East London R. Co.*, L. R. 20 Eq. 544; *per Cockburn C.J. in Hipkins v. Birmingham Gas Co.*, 6 H. & N. 250; *Atty.-Gen. v. Furness R. Co.*, 47 L. J. Ch. 776; *Lamb v. N. London R. Co.*, L. R. 4 Ch. 522; *Clowes v.*

Indeed, if words in a local or personal Act seemed to express an intention to enact something unconnected with the purpose of the promoters, and which the committee, if they had done their duty, would not have allowed to be introduced, almost any construction, it has been said, would seem justifiable to prevent them from having that effect (*a*).

Even if such statutes were not regarded in the light of contracts (*b*), they would seem to be subject to strict construction on the same ground as grants from the Crown, to which they are analogous, are subject to it. As the latter are construed strictly against the grantee, on the ground that prerogatives, rights, and emoluments are conferred on the Crown for great purposes and for the public use, and are therefore not to be understood as diminished by any grant beyond what it takes away by necessary and unavoidable construction (*c*) ; so the Legislature, in granting away, in effect, the ordinary rights of the subject, should be understood as granting no more than passes by necessary and unavoidable construction.

The principle of strict construction is less appli-

Staffordshire Potteries, L. R. 8 App. Cas. 743.

Ch. 125 ; *Altrincham v. Cheshire* (b) See *R. v. York and N.*
Lines Committee, 15 Q. B. D. Midland R. Co., 22 L. J. Q.
597. B. 41.

(a) *Per* Lord Blackburn in (c) *Per* Lord Stowell in *The*
Wear Commrs. v. Adamson, 2 Rebeckah, 1 C. Rob. 230.

cable where the powers are conferred on public bodies for essentially public purposes ; as, for instance, to those given to the Metropolitan Board of Works (a).

(a) *Per* Wood V.C. in *N. London R. Co. v. Metrop. B. of Works, Johns*. 405. See also *London R. Co., L. R. 3 Ch. 679* ; *Lyon v. Fishmongers' Co., 1 App. Cas. 662* ; *Venour's Case, 2 Ch. D. 522*.
524 ; *Atty.-Gen. v. Cambridge, L. R. 6 H. L. 303* ; *Richmond v. N. London R. Co., L. R. 3 Ch. 679* ; *Lyon v. Fishmongers' Co., 1 App. Cas. 662* ; *Venour's Case, 2 Ch. D. 522*.
774 ; *Galloway v. London (Mayor of), L. R. 1 H. L. 34* ; *Quinton v. Bristol (Mayor of), L. R. 17 Eq.*

CHAPTER XI.

SECTION I.—SOME SUBORDINATE PRINCIPLES—EFFECT OF USAGE.

It is said that the best exposition of a statute or any other document is that which it has received from contemporary authority. *Optima est legum interpretis consuetudo* (*a*). *Contemporanea expositio est optima et fortissima in lege* (*b*). Where this has been given by enactment or judicial decision, it is of course to be accepted as conclusive (*c*). But further, the meaning publicly given by contemporary, or long professional usage, is presumed to be the true one, even when the language has etymologically or popularly a different meaning. It is obvious that the language of a statute must be understood in the sense in which it was understood when it was passed (*d*); and those who lived at or near the

(*a*) Dig. i. 3, 37.

(*b*) 2 Inst. 11.

(*c*) See *ex. gr.*, *per* Hullock B. in *Booth v. Ibbotson*, 1 Yo. & J. 360; *per* Tindal C.J. in *Bank of England v. Anderson*,

3 Bing. N. C. 666; *per* Parke B. in *Doe v. Owens*, 10 M. & W. 521; *Curlewis v. Mornington*, 7 E. & B. 283.

(*d*) *Supra*, p. 83.

time when it was passed, may reasonably be supposed to be better acquainted than their descendants with the circumstances to which it had relation, as well as with the sense then attached to legislative expressions (*a*); moreover, the long acquiescence of the Legislature in the interpretation put upon its enactment by notorious practice, may, perhaps, be regarded as some sanction and approval of it (*b*). It often becomes, therefore, material to inquire what has been done under an Act; this being of more or less cogency, according to circumstances, for determining the meaning given by contemporaneous exposition (*c*).

It has been sometimes said, indeed, that usage is

- (*a*) *Co. Litt.* 8b; 2 *Inst.* 18, 282; *Bac. Ab. Stat.* (I.) 5; 2 *Hawk. c.* 9, s. 3; *Sheppard v. Gosnold*, *Vaugh.* 169; *per Lord Mansfield* in *R. v. Varlo*, 1 *Cowp.* 250; *per Lord Kenyon* in *Leigh v. Kent*, 3 *T. R.* 364, *Blankley v. Winstanley*, *Id.* 286, and *R. v. Scot*, *Id.* 604; *per Buller J.* in *R. v. Wallis*, 5 *T. R.* 380; *per Lord Ellenborough* in *Kitchen v. Bartsch*, 7 *East*, 53; *per Best C.J.* in *Stewart v. Lawton*, 1 *Bing.* 377; *per Lord Hardwicke* in *Atty.-Gen. v. Parker*, 3 *Atk.* 576; *per Lord Eldon* in *Atty.-Gen. v. Forster*, 10 *Ves.* 338; *per Parke B.* in *Jewison v. Dyson*, 9 *M. & W.* 556, and *Clift v. Schwabe*, 3 *C. B.* 469; *R. v. Mashiter*, 6 *A. & E.* 153; *R. v. Davie*, *Id.* 374; *Newcastle v. Atty.-Gen.*, 12 *Cl. & F.* 419; *Smith v. Lindo*, 4 *C. B. N. S.* 395; *R. v. Herford*, 3 *E. & E.* 115; *Atty.-Gen. v. Jones*, 2 *H. & C.* 347; *Marshall v. Bp. of Exeter*, 13 *C. B. N. S.* 820; *Montrose Peerage*, 1 *Macq. H. L.* 401.
- (*b*) See *per James L.J.* in *The Anna*, 1 *P. D.* 253.
- (*c*) *R. v. Canterbury (Abp. of)*, 11 *Q. B.* 581, *per Coleridge J.*

only the interpreter of an obscure law, but cannot control the language of a plain one; and that if it has put a wrong meaning on unambiguous language, it is rather an oppression of those concerned than an exposition of the Act, and must be corrected (*a*). It may, indeed, well be the rule, as Lord Eldon laid it down in a case of a breach of trust of charity property, that if the enjoyment of property had been clearly a continued breach for even two centuries, of a trust created by a deed or will, it would be just and right to disturb it (*b*). But it seems different where the Legislature has stood by and sanctioned by its uninterposition the construction put upon its own language by long and notorious usage; and the proposition above stated certainly falls short of the full effect which has been often given to usage. Authorities are not wanting to show that where the usage has been of an authoritative and public character, its interpretation has materially modified the meaning of apparently unequivocal language.

Thus, the statute 1 Westm. c. 10, for instance, which enacts that coroners shall be chosen of the most legal and wise knights, has been understood

(*a*) *Sheppard v. Gosnold*, 728; *per* Pollock C.B. in *Gwyn Vaugh.* 170; and *per* Lord *v. Hardwicke*, 1 H. & N. 53, and Brougham in *Dunbar v. Rox-* in *Pochin v. Duncombe*, Id. 856.
burghe, 3 Cl. & F. 354; *per* (*b*) *Per* Lord Eldon in *Atty.-*
Grose J. in R. v. Hogg, 1 T. R. *Gen. v. Bristol*, 2 Jac. & W. 321.

to admit of the election of coroners who are not knights, if they possessed land enough to qualify them for knighthood (*a*); though in one case a merchant appears to have been removed from a coronership for that he was *communis mercator* (*b*). So, a power given by the 6 Hen. VIII. c. 6, to the judges of the Queen's Bench, to issue a writ of *procedendo*, was held, from the course of practice, to be exercisable by a single judge at chambers (*c*). Although the 31 Eliz. c. 5, which limited the time for bringing actions on penal statutes to two years, when the action was brought for the Queen, and to one year, when brought as well for the Queen as for the informer, was silent as to actions brought for the informer alone; it was held, partly on the ground of long professional understanding, that the last-mentioned actions were limited to one year (*d*). Though the 15 Rich. II. enacted that the Admiralty should have no jurisdiction over contracts made in the bodies of counties, seamen engaging in England have, nevertheless, always been admitted to sue for wages in that Court (*e*), where the remedy is easier and better than in the Common Law Courts; on the ground, it has been said (*f*), that *communis error facit jus*; or rather, as was observed by

(*a*) F. N. B. 164.

Ex. 152.

(*b*) 2 Inst. 32.

(*e*) *Smith v. Tilly*, 1 Keb.

(*c*) *R. v. Scaife*, 17 Q. B. 238. 712.

See *Leigh v. Kent*, 3 T. R. 362.

(*f*) *Per* Lord Holt in *Clay v.*

(*d*) *Dyer v. Best*, L. R. 1 Sudgrave, 1 Salk. 33.

Lord Kenyon (*a*), not communis error, but uniform and unbroken usage, facit jus. "Were the language "obscure," said Lord Campbell in a celebrated case, "instead of being clear, we should not be justified in "differing from the construction put upon it by con-
 "temporaneous and long continued usage. There
 "would be no safety for property or liberty if it could
 "be successfully contended that all lawyers and
 "statesmen have been mistaken as to the true meaning
 "of an old Act of Parliament" (*b*). If we find an uniform interpretation of a statute materially affecting property and perpetually recurring, and which has been adhered to without interruption, it would be impossible to introduce the precedent of disregarding that interpretation (*c*).

This principle of construction would seem to be applicable to an ecclesiastical case of some celebrity. The rubric of the first prayer book of Edward VI. (1549) ordered that clergymen should wear albs and copes while administering the Communion. The second prayer book, with the 5 & 6 Ed. VI. c. 1, prohibited those vestments and substituted surplices. These last dresses were again ordered, by the conjoined effect of the 1 Eliz. c. 2 and the advertisements or orders issued in pursuance of it; and the former soon disappeared, the surplice becoming the sole

(*a*) In *R. v. Essex*, 4 T. R. 594. P. C. 650.

(*b*) *Gorham v. Bp. of Exeter*, (*c*) *Per* Lord Westbury in 15 Q. B. 73. See also *per Cur.* *Morgan v. Crawshay*, L. R. 5 in *Hebbert v. Purchas*, L. R. 3 H. L. 304, 320.

officiating vestment until the Restoration. The rubric of the prayer book of 1662, however, with the 13 & 14 Car. II. c. 4 (which confirmed the 1 Eliz. c. 2), directed that the vestments used under the book of 1549 "should be retained and be in use" (a); but the surplice alone continued to be worn for nearly two centuries. When the right or duty of wearing the old vestments was asserted, the Privy Council held that the last rubric (which has the force of a statute) did not repeal the Act and advertisements of Elizabeth, and must be read as if both were inserted in it (b). This construction, which was not reconcilable with the meaning of the words of the rubric, nor, perhaps, in harmony with the ordinary principles of interpretation, was, however, the construction which had been put upon it by long and general usage. Any other, indeed, it was remarked, would have been oppressive and unjust, by subjecting every clergyman who had failed to use the garments of the first book, to heavy penalties (c).

(a) Whether through disingenuousness or negligence? *Per* Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions*, p. 167. Semble, it was done advisedly; for the attention of the bishops had been called to the possibility of a return to vestments as the result of the wording; *Hebbert v. Purchas*, L. R. 3 P. C. 643;

see sup., 37.

(b) *Ridsdale v. Clifton*, 2 P. D. 276; *Kelly C.B.* and two other members of the Council dissenting. See letter to Lord Chancellor Cairns by Chief Baron Kelly, 1878, p. 14.

(c) *Id.* 308, and *Hebbert v. Purchas*, 617.

An Act passed in 1855, which directed that certain expenses incurred by churchwardens should be repaid by the overseers on the certificate of the churchwardens, was construed by the light of the inveterate practice of thirty-five years, especially as it was also the reasonable construction, of requiring payment by the overseers on the precept of the churchwardens, though the latter had not paid the money (*a*).

The Court of Queen's Bench was influenced in its construction of a statute of Anne by the fact that it was that which had been generally considered the true one for one hundred and sixty years (*b*). Even a very modern Act has received an interpretation from authoritative usage which could hardly have been otherwise given to it. The Central Criminal Court Act, 4 & 5 Will. IV. c. 36, which empowers the judges of that Court, or any "two or more" of them, to try all offences which might be tried under a commission of oyer and terminer for London or Middlesex, was construed to authorise a single judge to try; such having been the inveterate practice under the Act (*c*).

(*a*) 18 & 19 Vict. c. 128, s. 18; *R. v. St. Mary Islington*, 25 Q. B. D. 523. L.J. in *The Anna*, 1 P. D. 253. Comp. however, *Clow v. Harper*, 3 Ex. D. 198; *Hamilton v.*

(*b*) *Cox v. Leigh*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 333. *Baker*, 14 App. Cas. 209. And see *per* Lords Blackburn and

(*c*) *R. v. Levenson*, L. R. 4 Q. B. 394; see *Stuart v. Laird*, 1 Cranch, 299; and *per* James Watson in *Clyde Navigation v. Laird*, 8 App. Cas. 658. See also *R. v. Lloyd*, 19 Q. B. D.

When the question arose whether a person convicted at one time of several offences could be considered, at the time of the adjudication, as "in prison undergoing imprisonment," within the 25th section of the 11 & 12 Vict. c. 43 (which authorises the convicting justice, in that case, to make the period of imprisonment for the second offence begin from the expiration of that of the first), it was decided in the affirmative, partly, indeed, in conformity with the construction put on the analogous enactment in the 7 & 8 Geo. IV. c. 28, but partly also in consequence of the practice of the judges for forty years (*a*).

In all these cases, a contrary resolution would, to use the words of Parker, C.J. (*b*), have been an overturning of the justice of the nation for years past. The understanding which is accepted as authoritative on such questions, however, is not that which has been speculative merely, or floating in the minds of professional men; it must have been long acted on in general practice (*c*), and publicly. A mere

213, where the practice of examining a bankrupt not in the presence of the Registrar, though the Bankruptcy Act directed that it should be before him, was fatal in an indictment for perjury.

(*a*) *R. v. Cutbush*, L. R. 2 Q. B. 379. See also the Duke of Buccleuch *v. Metrop. B. of*

Works, L. R. 5 Ex. 251; *Migneault v. Malo*, L. R. 4 P. C. 123.

(*b*) In *R. v. Bewdley*, 1 P. Wms. 223.

(*c*) *Per* Lord Ellenborough in *Isherwood v. Oldknow*, 3 M. & S. 396; *per* Lord Cottenham in *the Waterford Peerage*, 6 Cl. & F. 173; *per* James L.J. in *Re Ford*, 10 Ch. D. 370.

general practice, for instance, which had grown up in a long series of years, on the part of the officers of the Crown, of not using patented inventions without remuneration to the patentee, under the impression that the Crown was precluded from using them without his license, was held ineffectual to control the true construction or true state of the law; which was that the Crown was not excluded from their use (*a*).

An universal law cannot receive different interpretations in different towns (*b*). A mere local usage cannot be invoked to construe a general enactment, even for the locality (*c*). A fortiori is this the case, when the local custom is manifestly at variance with the object of the Act; as, for instance, a custom for departing from the standard of weights and measures, which the Legislature plainly desires to make obligatory on all and everywhere (*d*).

Usage, ancient and modern, if certain, invariable, and not unreasonable, has often been admitted to throw light on the construction of old deeds, charters, and other documents (*e*).

(*a*) *Feather v. R.*, 6 B. & S. 257.

(*b*) *Per Grose J. in R. v. Hogg*, 1 T. R. 728.

(*c*) *R. v. Saltren*, Cald. 444.

(*d*) *Noble v. Durell*, 3 T. R. 271.

(*e*) See *ex. gr. Withnell v. Gartham*, 6 T. R. 388; *Doe v. Ries*, 8 Bing. 181, *per Tindal C.J.*; *Wadley v. Bayliss*, 5 Taunt. 752; *Beaufort v. Swansea*, 3 Ex. 413; *Bradley v. Newcastle*, 2 E. & B. 427.

SECTION II.—CONSTRUCTION IMPOSED BY STATUTE.

When the Legislature puts a construction on an Act, a subsequent cognate enactment in the same terms would, *primâ facie*, be understood in the same sense. Thus, as the 125th section of the Bankrupt Act of 6 Geo. IV., which made void securities given by a bankrupt to creditors, as a consideration for signing the bankrupt's certificate, was stated in the preamble of the 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 41, to have had the effect of making such securities void even in the hands of innocent holders for value, and was modified so as to make them valid in such hands; it was considered, when the Act of Geo. IV. was repealed, and its 125th section was re-enacted in its original terms in the Bankrupt Act of 1849, that the renewed enactment ought to receive the construction which the preamble of the 5 & 6 Will. IV. had put on the earlier one (*a*). The expression "taxed cart," in a local Act, was held to mean a vehicle which had been defined as a taxed cart by the 43 Geo. III. c. 161 (*b*).

Where it is gathered from a later Act, that the Legislature attached a certain meaning to certain words in an earlier cognate one, this would be taken as a legislative declaration of its meaning there (*c*).

(*a*) *Goldsmid v. Hampton*, 5 Smith, 1 E. & E. 511. See *Ward v. Beck*, 13 C. B. N. S. 668.

(*b*) *Williams v. Lear*, L. R. 7 (c) *R. v. Smith*, 4 T. R. 419;
Q. B. 285, overruling *Purdy v. Morris v. Mellin*, 6 B. & C. 454.

It may be taken for granted that the Legislature is acquainted with the actual state of the law (a). Therefore, when the words of an old statute are either transcribed into, or by reference made part of a new statute, this is understood to be done with the object of adopting any legal interpretation which has been put on them by the Courts (b). So, the same words appearing in a subsequent Act in *pari materiâ*, the presumption arises that they are used in the meaning which had been judicially put on them; and unless there be something to rebut that presumption, the new statute is to be construed as the old one was (c). One reason, for instance, for holding that the 534th section of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854, which limits the liability of shipowners, did not extend to foreign ships, was that the enactment was taken

(a) *Per* Lord Blackburn in 480; *Exp. Thorne*, 3 Ch. D. 457; *Exp. Attwater*, 5 Ch. D. 8 App. Cas. 526; *Exp. Kent* 27; *per* James L.J. in *Exp. C.C.*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 725. *Campbell*, 5 Ch. D. 706; *per*

(b) *Per* James L.J. in *Dale's* Lord Coleridge C.J. in *Barlow Case*, 6 Q. B. D. 453; and in *v. Teal*, 15 Q. B. D. 405; *per* *Greaves v. Tofield*, 14 Ch. D. Fry L.J. in *Avery v. Wood*, 571; *per* Mathew J. in *Clark* [1891] 3 Ch. 118; and *per* *v. Wallond*, 52 L. J. Q. B. 322; Lindley L.J. in *Colonial Bank Jay v. Johnstone*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 25, 189. And see as to Consolidation Acts, *supra*, p. 84. *v. Whinney*, 30 Ch. D. 285. Comp. the remarks of Byles J. in *St. Losky v. Green*, 9 C. B.

(c) *Mansell v. R.*, 8 E. & B. N. S. 370; and see *ex. gr.* 73; *per* Blackburn J. in *Jones Sturgis v. Darrell*, 4 H. & N. *v. Mersey Dock Co.*, 11 H. L. C. 622, *sup.*, p. 363.

from the 53 Geo. III. c. 159, which had received that construction judicially (a). On similar grounds, Order XXXI. of the Judicature Act, 1875, r. 11, received the same construction as had been given to the earlier enactment from which it was copied (b).

Even where the Acts are not in *pari materiâ*, the meaning notoriously given to expressions in the earlier, may be taken to be that in which they are used in the later Act. Thus the Income Tax Act, 1842, which exempts from charge property applicable to "charitable uses," was held to use this expression in the wide sense given to it in the Statute of Charitable Uses (43 Eliz. c. 4) (c).

But an Act of Parliament does not alter the law by merely betraying an erroneous opinion of it (d). For instance, the 7 Jac. I. c. 12, which enacted that shop books should not be evidence above a year before action, did not make them evidence within the year; though the enactment was obviously passed under the impression, not improbably confirmed by the practice of the Courts in those days, that they were admissible in evidence (e). So, an Act of Ed. VI., continuing till

(a) *Per* Turner L.J. in *Cope* B. 152.

v. Doherty, 27 L. J. Ch. 610.

(d) See ex. gr. *per* Ashurst J.

(b) *Bustros v. White*, 1 Q. B. D. 423.

in *Dore v. Gray*, 2 T. R. 358; *Exp. Lloyd*, 1 Sim. N. S. 248,

(c) 5 & 6 Vict. c. 35, s. 61;

per Shadwell V.C.

Income Tax Commissioners v. Pemsel, [1891] A. C. 531; *Inland Rev. v. Scott*, [1892], 2 Q.

(e) *Pitman v. Maddox*, 2 Salk. 690. See also *Dore v. Gray*, 2 T. R. 358.

the end of next session an Act of Hen. VIII., which was not limited in duration, was considered to be idle in that respect, and not to abrogate it (*a*). An Act which provided that no more than sixpence in the pound should be paid for appraisement, in cases of distress for rent, "whether by one broker or more," did not alter the earlier law which required that goods distrained for rent should be appraised by two brokers (*b*).

A passage in an Act which showed that the Legislature assumed that a certain kind of beer might be lawfully sold without a license, could not be treated as an enactment that such beer might be so sold, when the law imposed a penalty on every unlicensed person who sold any beer (*c*). The 41 & 42 Vict. c. 77, s. 7, which provided that the Public Health Act of 1875, s. 149, which vests the "streets" of a town in its local authority, should not be construed to pass minerals to the local authority, was considered not to afford the inference that the soil and freehold of the streets vested in all other respects (*d*). Earlier bankrupt Acts, in making traders having the privilege of Parliament

(*a*) The Prices of Wine, Hob. Q. B. D. 116; Wandsworth Bd. of Works v. United Telephone Co., 13 Q. B. D. 904; 215.

(*b*) Allen v. Flicker, 10 A. & E. 640. Rolls v. St. George Southwark,

(*c*) Read v. Storey, 6 H. & N. 423; see 24 & 25 Vict. c. 21, s. 3. 14 Ch. D. 785; Baird v. Tunbridge Wells, [1894] 2 Q. B. 867. See Brantom v. Griffiths, 1

(*d*) Coverdale v. Charlton, 4 C. P. D. 355, per Brett J.

liable to be made bankrupts, had expressly provided that they should be exempted from arrest; but when the Bankrupt Act of 1861 enacted that all debtors should be liable to bankruptcy, without making any similar provision on behalf of peers and members of Parliament, it was held that they were nevertheless protected by the privilege (*a*).

Many enclosure Acts were passed under the once prevalent opinion that the lord of a manor had a seignorial right of sporting over every part of the manor; whereas he had only a right of sporting over the waste, as incident to the ownership of the land (*b*). When those Acts divested the freehold out of him, and vested it in the tenants, among whom they allotted it, but reserved to the lord all the rights of sporting which had been enjoyed by himself and his predecessors, a conflict of opinion arose as to whether this reservation entitled the lord to the right of shooting over the enclosures (*c*).

The 7 & 8 Vict. c. 29, in reciting that the 9 Geo. IV. c. 69, which punishes night poaching on "land, "whether open or enclosed," had been evaded by the destruction of game, not on open and enclosed lands as described in that Act, but upon public roads

(*a*) *Newcastle v. Morris*, L. 3 M. & Gr. 139; *Ewart v. R. 4 H. L. 661.* *Graham*, 7 H. L. C. 331; *Sowerby*

(*b*) *Pickering v. Noyes*, 4 B. v. *Smith*, L. R. 9 C. P. 524; & C. 639. *Devonshire (Duke) v. O'Connor*,

(*c*) See *Greathead v. Morley*, 24 Q. B. D. 468.

and paths, and in making provision to meet the evasion, proceeded on an erroneous view of the law; for public roads and paths are "lands" within the meaning of the earlier Act; and the person who kills game while standing on them is a trespasser, not being there in the exercise of the right of way which alone justified his presence there, but for the purpose of unlawfully seeking game (*a*).

In the case of the *Franconia* (*b*), the majority of the judges held that the Criminal Courts of this country had no jurisdiction to try a foreigner for manslaughter committed while he was sailing in a foreign ship within three miles from the coast of England; although several Acts of Parliament had assumed jurisdiction, for the purposes of navigation, revenue, and fisheries (*c*), over foreigners for acts done within the three mile zone; and one statute (*d*) had declared that the minerals below low-water mark (in Cornwall) belonged to the Crown. The three mile zone, too, is, in international law, so far considered a part of the adjoining land, that capture within it is bad.

Provisions sometimes found in statutes enacting imperfectly or for particular cases only that which

(*a*) *R. v. Pratt*, 4 E. & B. 17 & 18 Vict. c. 104, s. 527; 860; *Mayhew v. Wardley*, 14 33 & 34 Vict. c. 90, s. 52; 39 C. B. N. S. 550. & 40 Vict. c. 36, s. 179.

(*b*) *R. v. Keyn*, 2 Ex. D. 63. (*d*) 21 & 22 Vict. c. 109.

(*c*) 59 Geo. III. c. 38, s. 2;

was already and more widely the law, have occasionally furnished ground for the contention that an intention to alter the general law was to be inferred from the partial or limited enactment; resting on the maxim, *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*. But that maxim is inapplicable in such cases. The only inference which a Court can draw from such superfluous provisions (which generally find a place in Acts to meet unfounded objections and idle doubts), is that the Legislature was either ignorant or unmindful of the real state of the law, or that it acted under the influence of excessive caution; and if the law be different from what the Legislature supposed it to be, the implication arising from the statute, it has been said, cannot operate as a negation of its existence (*a*); and any legislation founded on such a mistake has not the effect of making that law which the Legislature erroneously assumed to be so. Thus, when in contending that debts due by corporate bodies were subject to foreign attachment in the Mayor's Court, the express statutory exemptions of the East India Company and of the Bank of England were relied upon as supplying the inference that corporate bodies were deemed by the Legislature to be subject to that process, the judicial answer was that it was more reasonable to hold that the two

(*a*) *Per Cur.* in *Mollwo v. C.J. in Shrewsbury v. Scott*, 6 Court of Wards, L. R. 4 P. C. C. B. N. S. 1. 419, 437; and see *per Cockburn*

great corporations prevailed on Parliament to prevent all questions as to themselves by direct enactment, than to hold that Parliament by such special enactment meant to determine the question in all other cases adversely to corporations (*a*). A local Act which, in imposing wharfage dues for the maintenance of a harbour on certain articles, expressly exempted the Crown from liability in respect of coals imported for the use of royal packets; and the provisions in turnpike Acts (*b*), which exempted from toll carriages and horses attending the Queen, or going or returning from such attendance; were not suffered to affect the more extensive exemptions which the Crown enjoys by virtue of its prerogative (*c*).

On the other hand it has been laid down that where a statute confers powers upon a company, which the company as owner of property could have exercised without statutory power, the powers expressly given must be treated either as superfluous, or as purposely inserted in order to define, that is limit, the right conferred, and as implying a prohibition of the exercise of the more extensive rights which the company might have by virtue of its ownership of property, and that it cannot admit of

(*a*) *London Joint Stock Bank v. Mayor of London*, 1 C. P. D. 17. (*c*) *Weymouth v. Nugent*, 6 B. & S. 22; *Westover v. Perkins*, 2 E. & E. 57; *Smithett v.*

(*b*) 3 Geo. IV. c. 126, s. 32, Blythe, 1 B. & Ad. 509.
and 4 Geo. IV. c. 95, s. 24.

doubt that the latter is the true mode of regarding statutory powers conferred on bodies created for public purposes, and authorised to acquire land for such purposes (*a*).

A mere recital in an Act, whether of fact or of law, is not conclusive, but Courts are at liberty to consider the fact or the law to be different from the statement in the recital; unless, indeed, it be clear that the Legislature intended that the law should be, or the fact should be regarded to be (*b*), as recited. If, for instance, a road was stated in an Act to be in a certain township, or a town to be a corporate borough, the statement, though some evidence of the fact alleged, would be open to contradiction (*c*). The 36 & 37 Vict. c. 60, s. 3, would hardly, by merely reciting that "an accessory after the fact" is "by English law liable to be punished as if he were the principal offender," be understood as making so important a change of the law.

In all these cases, no inference necessarily arose that the Legislature intended to alter the law, and to

(*a*) *London Assoc. of Ship-owners v. London & Indian Docks*, [1893] 3 Ch. 246.

(*b*) The 34 Geo. III. c. 54, reciting that a conspiracy had been formed for subverting the laws and constitution, and for introducing the anarchy prevalent in France; this recital

was relied on as proof of the conspiracy in the treason trials of 1794, *per* Eyre C.J. in addressing the Grand Jury in Hardy's Case, 24 State Trials 200.

(*c*) *R. v. Haughton*, 1 E. & B. 501, and *R. v. Greene*, 6 A. & E. 548.

make it as it was alleged to be. A different effect, however, would be given to an Act which showed, whether by recital or enactment, that it intended to effect a change. If the mistake is manifested in words competent to make the law in future, there is no principle which can deny them this effect (*a*). Such was the effect of the 4 & 5 Vict. c. 48, which enacted that municipal corporations should be rateable in respect of their property, as though it were not corporate property; but that such property, when lying wholly within a borough the poor of which were relieved by one entire poor rate, should continue exempt from rateability "as if the "Act had not passed." When the Act was passed, the general opinion was that such property was exempt; but later decisions settled that it was not. It was held that the above enactment exempted them, notwithstanding the final words, which were considered as not conveying a different intention (*b*). One ground on which the Exchequer Chamber held that the attesting words, "on the true faith of a "Christian," of the abjuration oath were essential parts of the oath, was that Parliament had put that construction on them, when allowing the Jews, a few years after enacting the oath, to omit those words when the oath was tendered to them *ex officio* (*c*).

(*a*) *Per Cur.* in *P. M. Genl.* (c) 1 Geo. I. st. 2, c. 15, 10
v. Early, 12 Wheat. 148. Geo. I. c. 4; *Salomons v. Miller*,

(*b*) *R. v. Oldham Corporation*, 8 Ex. 778.
L. R. 3 Q. B. 474.

A statute of the United States enacted that the district court should, in certain cases, have concurrent jurisdiction with the state and circuit courts, as if (contrary to the fact) the district court had not already, and the circuit court had, jurisdiction. But though the language plainly indicated only the opinion that the jurisdiction existed in the circuit court, and not an intention to confer it, this effect was nevertheless given to the Act, to prevent its being inoperative, and to carry out what was the obvious object of the Act (*a*). The district court could not have had concurrent jurisdiction with the circuit court, unless the latter could take cognizance of the same suits.

SECTION III.—CONSTRUCTION OF WORDS IN BONAM PARTEM—EFFECT OF MULTIPLICITY OF WORDS—OF VARIATION OF LANGUAGE.

It is said, and in a certain and limited sense truly, that words must be taken in a lawful and rightful sense. When an Act, for instance, gave a certain efficacy to a fine levied of land, it meant only a fine lawfully levied (*b*). The provision that a judgment in the Lord Mayor's Court, when removed to the Superior Court, shall have the same effect as a judgment of the latter, would not apply to a judgment which the in-

(*a*) P. M. Genl. v. Early, 12 Wheat. 136.

(*b*) Co. Litt. 381b; 2 Inst. 590.

ferior tribunal had no jurisdiction to pronounce (a). The landlord's claim to recover arrears of rent out of goods seized in execution by the bailiff of a county court, under the County Court Act, 1888, depends upon whether the seizure was lawful. If the goods did not belong to the debtor, and the seizure was consequently unlawful, the claim under the section could not arise (b). A rule of a building society authorising a director to reimburse himself for any loss incurred in executing the powers given him by the rules, does not apply to acts ultra vires and beyond the powers the society could confer (c). So, an Act which requires the payment of rates as a condition precedent to the exercise of the franchise would not be construed as excluding from it a person who refused to pay a rate which was illegal, though so far valid that it had not been quashed or appealed against (d). A covenant by a tenant to pay all parliamentary taxes is construed to include only such as he may lawfully pay, but not the landlord's property tax, which it would be illegal for him to engage to pay (e). A statutory authority to abate nuisances

- (a) *Bridge v. Branch*, 1 C. P. Soc., 59 L. J. Q. B. 525.
D. 633. (d) *R. v. Windsor* (Mayor
of), 7 Q. B. 908. See also
(b) 51 & 52 Vict. c. 43, s. 160; *Hughes v. Smallwood*, 25 Q. B. D. 306. *Comp. Beard v. Knight*, 8 E. & B. 865; *Foulger v. Taylor*, 5 H. & N. 202.
(c) *Cullerne v. London Bldg. Board v. Harrow Gas Co.*, L. R. 381. (e) *Gaskell v. King*, 11 East, 165. See *Edgeware Highway*

would not justify an order to abate one, when it could not be obeyed without committing a trespass (*a*).

A highway surveyor, who is required by the Highway Act of 1862 to "conform in all respects to the "orders of the board in the execution of his duties," is, like the clergyman who had sworn canonical obedience to his bishop (*b*), bound to obey only lawful orders, which his superior has authority to give; so that he is personally liable for his act, if the board had no jurisdiction to make the order under which he did it (*c*). The 199th section of the Companies Act, 1862, providing for the winding-up of companies of more than seven members not registered under the Act, applies only to companies which may be lawfully formed without registration, but not to those which are prohibited unless registered (*d*). But money earned in an unlawful "vocation" is properly assessed to the income tax (*e*).

Where analogous words are used, each may be presumed to be susceptible of a separate and distinct mean-

10 Q. B. 92; *Owen v. Body*, 5 A. & E. 28.

(*a*) Public Health Act, 1875, 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55; *Mayor of Scarborough v. Rural Authority of Scarborough*, 1 Ex. D. 344; but see *Parker v. Inge*, 17 Q. B. D. 584.

(*b*) *Long v. Gray*, 1 Moo. N. S. 411.

(*c*) *Mill v. Hawker*, L. R. 10 Ex. 92; comp. *Dews v. Riley*, 11 C. B. 434.

(*d*) *Re Padstow, etc., Assoc.*, 20 Ch. D. 137; *Shaw v. Benson*, 11 Q. B. D. 563.

(*e*) 5 & 6 Vict. c. 35, Sch. D; *Partridge v. Mallandine*, 18 Q. B. D. 276.

ing; for the Legislature is not supposed to use words without a meaning (a). But the use of tautologous expressions is not uncommon in statutes, and there is no such presumption against fulness, or even superfluity of expression, in statutes, or other written instruments, as amounts to a rule of interpretation, controlling what might otherwise be their proper construction (b).

It has been justly remarked that, when precision is required, no safer rule can be followed than always to call the same thing by the same name (c). It is, at all events, reasonable to presume that the same meaning is intended for the same expression in every part of an Act (d). Accordingly, in ascertaining the meaning to be attached to a particular word in a section of an Act, though the proper course would seem to be to ascertain that meaning if possible from

(a) See ex. gr. the distinction between "rights" and "interests" in the International Copyright Act (49 & 50 Vict. c. 33), s. 6; *Moul v. Groenings*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 443; between moneys paid "under" and "in respect of" a gaming contract, *Tatam v. Reeve*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 44; and see another example in *Brighton Guardians v. Strand Guardians*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 156.

(b) *Per* Lord Selborne L.C. in *Hough v. Windus*, 12 Q. B.

D. 229.

(c) Sir G. C. Lewis, *Obs. and Reas. in Polit.*, vol. i. p. 91.

(d) *Courtauld v. Legh*, L. R. 4 Ex. 40, *per* Cleasby B.; *R. v. Poor Law Commrs.*, 6 A. & E. 68, *per* Lord Denman; *Re Kirkstall Brewery*, 5 Ch. D. 535. *Comp. the judgments of Cockburn C.J. in Smith v. Brown*, L. R. 6 Q. B. 729, and of Baggalay L.J. in *The Franconia*, 2 P. D. 174.

a consideration of the section itself; yet, if the meaning cannot be so ascertained, then, on the principle that, as a general rule, a word is to be considered as used throughout an Act in the same sense, other sections may be looked at to fix the sense in which the word is there used (a).

But the presumption is not of much weight. In the 12 & 13 Vict. c. 96, for instance, which makes any "person" in a British possession charged with any crime at sea liable to be tried in the colony, and provides that where the offence is murder or manslaughter of any "person" who dies in the colony of an injury feloniously inflicted at sea, the offence shall be considered as having been committed wholly at sea; the word "person" would include any human being, when relating to the sufferer, but would, as regards the offender, include only those persons who, on general principles of law, are subject to the jurisdiction of our Legislature, and responsible for their acts (b). In the enactment which makes it felony for any one, "being married," to "marry" again while the former marriage is in force, the same word has obviously two different meanings, necessarily implying the validity of the marriage in the one case, and as necessarily excluding it in the other (c). And

(a) *Per* Jessel M.R. in *Lewis, Dears. & B.* 182, and *Spencer v. Metrop. Bd.* of other cases cited, *sup.*, p. 200 et *Works*, 22 Ch. D. 142. *seqq.*

(b) See *U. S. v. Palmer*, 3 (c) *R. v. Allen*, L. R. 1 C. C. Wheat. 631; and see *R. v.* 367. For another illustration

though, by s. 27 (2) of the Metropolitan Building Act, 1855, separate sets of chambers in large buildings are to be deemed to be "separate buildings," and to be separated by proper party-walls, etc., accordingly, it has been held that they are not separate buildings within the meaning of Schedule II., Part I., of the same Act, under which the district surveyor is entitled to charge a fee in respect of "every" new "building" surveyed by him (*a*).

The case of *Forth v. Chapman* (*b*) furnishes a well-known instance of a single passage in a will receiving two different interpretations, according to the nature of the property to which it was applied; a devise of freehold and leasehold property to a person, with remainder over if he died "without issue," being construed to mean, as regarded the freehold, failure of issue at any future time, but as regarded the leasehold, a failure of issue at the death of the devisee. But this construction, which Lord Kenyon (*c*) considered hardly illustrative of the saying that *lex plus laudatur quando ratione probatur*, and which has since been partially set aside

- | | |
|---|---|
| see <i>Pharmaceutical Soc. v. Piper & Co.</i> , [1893] 1 Q. B. 686 (approved in <i>Pharmaceutical Society v. Armson</i> , [1894] 2 Q. B. 720), where the word "article" is said to have different meanings in different parts of s. 17 of 31 & 32 Vict. c. 121. | (<i>a</i>) 18 & 19 Vict. c. 122; <i>Moir v. Williams</i> , [1892] 1 Q. B. 264. |
| | (<i>b</i>) 1 P. Wms. 663; <i>Crooke v. De Vandes</i> , 9 Ves. 203, <i>per</i> Lord Eldon. |
| | (<i>c</i>) <i>Porter v. Bradley</i> , 3 T. R. 146. |

by the Wills Act (*a*), was attributable to the different principles of interpretation adopted by the Common Law and Ecclesiastical Courts, under whose cognizance wills of the two kinds of property respectively and exclusively fell (*b*).

So, it seems to have been once thought that in the Act of Anne, which gave the loser at play a right to recover by action his losses above £10, when lost at a single sitting, and gave an informer the right to recover them, and treble value besides, if the loser did not take proceedings in time, the expression "a single sitting" might receive two different meanings, according as the plaintiff was the loser, or an informer : that is, that a sitting suspended for dinner should be held single and continuous when the loser sued, but be broken into two sittings when the action was brought by the informer ; on the ground that in the one case the act was remedial, and therefore entitled to a beneficial construction, while in the latter it was penal, and therefore was to be construed strictly (*c*). But unquestionably the interpreter is bound, in general, to disclaim the right to assign different meanings to the same words on the ground of a supposed general intention of the Legislature (*d*).

(*a*) 1 & 2 Vict. c. 26, s. 29 ; cited.

Re Bence, [1891] 3 Ch. 242.

(*c*) *Bones v. Booth*, 2 W. Bl.

(*b*) *Fearne*, Cont. Rem. 476. 1226.

See *Wingfield v. Wingfield*, 9

(*d*) *Per Lord Denman in R. v.*

Ch. D. 658, and the cases there

Poor Law Comm., 6 A. & E. 56.

As the same expression is as a general rule to be presumed to be used in the same sense throughout an Act, or a series of cognate Acts, a change of language suggests the presumption of change of intention (*a*); and as has been seen, the change of language in the later of two statutes on the same subject has often the effect of repealing the earlier provision by implication (*b*). Where a limited interpretation has been placed upon prior Acts of Parliament, and the words of an amending Act have been enlarged, the inference is that the enlargement must have been intentional on the part of the Legislature (*c*). So where by earlier enactments, penalties on members of Parliament for sitting and voting before being sworn were expressly recoverable by common informers, and by a repealing Act the penalties were made recoverable by action, without saying by whom, it was held that the common informer could not sue, but only the Crown (*d*). And it has been held that where section after section of an Act relating to the winding up of companies is limited to winding up by the Court, the absence of any such limitation in another section which contains provisions as to procedure "if the winding up of a company is

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Per</i> Lord Tenterden in <i>R. v. Great Bolton</i>, 8 B. & C. 74; <i>Ricket v. Met. R. Co.</i>, L. R. 2 H. L. 207.</p> <p>(<i>b</i>) See cases cited <i>supra</i>, pp. 220-226.</p> | <p>(<i>c</i>) <i>Hurlbutt v. Barnett</i>, [1893] 1 Q. B. 77.</p> <p>(<i>d</i>) 29 & 30 Vict. c. 19, s. 5; <i>Bradlaugh v. Clarke</i>, 8 App. Cas. 354.</p> |
|---|--|

“not concluded within a year after its commencement,” indicates an intention on the part of the Legislature that the latter section shall apply to cases of voluntary winding up also (*a*).

Where one section of the Adulteration of Food Act imposed a penalty for selling, as unadulterated, articles of food which were adulterated; and another provided that the seller of an article of food who, knowing that it was mixed with a foreign substance to increase its bulk or weight, did not declare the admixture to the purchaser, should be deemed to have sold an adulterated article; the former section would reach a seller who was ignorant of the adulteration; since, where knowledge was intended to be an element in an offence under the Act, the Legislature had conveyed its intention in express terms (*b*). The 9 Geo. IV. c. 14, which admits of no acknowledgment of a debt to bar the Statute of Limitations unless it be signed by “the party chargeable thereby,” was held not satisfied by the signature of an agent, partly because other provisions spoke expressly of agents as well as of principals, and thus showed that the Legislature had not in its contemplation the maxim that *qui facit per alium facit per se* (*c*).

(*a*) 53 & 54 Vict. c. 63, s. 15; *Re Stock & Share Banking & Auction Co.*, [1894] 1 Ch. 736. R. 8 Q. B. 337. See *Pope v. Tearle*, L. R. 9 C. P. 499; *Roberts v. Egerton*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 494.

(*c*) *Hyde v. Johnson*, 2 Bing. N. C. 776.

Where an Act recited and repealed an earlier one, which had authorised two justices, "whereof one to "be of the quorum," to remove any person "likely to "be" chargeable to the parish, and enacted that no person should be removed until "actually" chargeable, when "two justices" (omitting all mention of either being on the quorum) might remove him; it was held that this qualification was not necessary under the later Act (*a*).

A man who sends his servants or his dogs on the land of another, would be, in law, as much a trespasser as if he had entered on the land in person (*b*); but an Act which imposed a penalty for committing a trespass "by entering or being" upon land, would be construed as limiting, by these superadded words, the trespass to a personal entrance (*c*).

The 59th section of the Pilot Act, 6 Geo. IV. c. 125, which exempts from compulsory pilotage any ship whatever which "is" within the limits of the port to which she belongs, was construed as exempting from compulsory pilotage a London vessel while within the port of London, though on a voyage from Bordeaux; but she would not have been exempted under the 379th section of the Merchant Shipping

- | | |
|--|---|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>R. v. Llangian</i> , 4 B. & S. | Marsh. 582. |
| 249, diss. Cockburn C.J. | (<i>c</i>) <i>R. v. Pratt</i> , 4 E. & B. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Baker v. Berkeley</i> , 3 C. & | 860; and see <i>Read v. Edwards</i> , |
| P. 32; <i>Dimmock v. Allenby</i> , 2 | 17 C. B. N. S. 245. |

Act of 1854, which exempts ships "navigating" within the limits of the port to which they belong (*a*). In an Act (59 Geo. III. c. 50) which provided that no person should acquire a settlement in a parish by a forty days' residence in a tenement rented by him, unless, if a house, it was "held," and if land, it was "occupied" by him for a year, effect was given to the two different words as expressing different ideas, by holding that a house need not be "occupied" for the purpose of acquiring a settlement (*b*); though, it was observed, this was probably not really intended by the Legislature (*c*).

But just as the presumption that the same meaning is intended for the same expression in every part of an Act is, as we have seen, not of much weight, so the presumption of a change of intention from a change of language, of no great weight in the construction of any documents, seems entitled to less weight in the construction of a statute than in any other case; for the variation is sometimes to be ac-

(*a*) *The Stettin*, Br. & Lush. 199. But see *Genl. St. Nav. Co. v. Brit. & Colon. St. Nav. Co.*, L. R. 4 Ex. 238. Collingham, *ubi sup.* See other illustrations in *Lawrence v. King*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 345; *Exp. Goreley*, 4 De G. J. & S. 477;

(*b*) *R. v. North Collingham*, 1 B. & C. 578; *R. v. Great Bolton*, 8 B. & C. 71. *Gale v. Laurie*, 5 B. & C. 156; *Cornill v. Hudson*, 8 E. & B. 429; *Wiley v. Crawford*, 1 B.

(*c*) *Per Best J. in R. v. N.* & S. 253.

counted for by a mere desire of improving the graces of style, and of avoiding the repeated use of the same words (*a*), often from the circumstance that the Act has been compiled from different sources; and further, from the alterations and additions from various hands which Acts undergo in their progress through Parliament. Though the statute is the language of the three estates of the realm, it seems legitimate, in construing it, to take into consideration that it may have been the production of many minds; and that this may better account for the variety of style and phraseology which is found, than a desire to convey a different intention. Even where the variation occurs in different statutes the change is often not indicative of a change of intention. Thus there is no difference between a "stream" and a "river" in the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 109, ss. 27, 28 (*b*); and "ordinary luggage" in an Act, and "personal luggage" in a bye-law made under it, have been construed as meaning the same thing (*c*). So, there can be no material difference between "suffering" and "knowingly suffering" persons to gamble in a public-

(*a*) *Per* Blackburn J. in *Hadley v. Perks*, L. R. 1 Q. B. 444, and Lord Abinger in *R. v. Frost*, 9 C. & P. 129; *per* Lindley L.J. in *Brace v. Abercarn Colliery Co.*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 705. As

to accident see *sup.*, 351-353.

(*b*) *Rolle v. Whyte*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 305.

(*c*) *Hudston v. Midland R. Co.*, L. R. 4 Q. B. 366.

house (α). To "turn cattle loose" on a public thoroughfare, which is subject to a penalty by the Police Act, 2 & 3 Vict. c. 47, s. 54, is substantially identical with "leaving cattle" there "without a keeper," contrary to the Highway Act, 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 50, s. 74 (b); and the definition in the 6 & 7 Vict. c. 86, of a hackney carriage, as a carriage plying for hire in "any public place," is identical in meaning with the earlier Act 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 22, which defined it as plying for hire in any "street or road" (c). It may be questioned whether too much importance has not sometimes been attached to a variation of language (d).

An Act which enacted that "it shall and may be lawful" for a justice to hear a certain class of cases under £50, and that penalties above that sum "shall" (e) be sued for in the Superior Courts, was held equally imperative in both cases, even though the effect was to oust the jurisdiction of the Superior Courts in the former (f). So, though one section of the 3 Geo. IV. c. 39, made a warrant of attorney to

(a) 9 Geo. IV. c. 61; 35 & Weald, 5 B. & S. 391; *Exp.*
36 Vict. c. 94; *Bosley v. Davies*, Jarman, 4 Ch. D. 835.
1 Q. B. D. 84. (e) 25 Geo. III. c. 51. See

(b) *Sherborn v. Wells*, 3 B. ex. gr. *Haldane v. Beaucherk*, 3
& S. 784. Ex. 658; *Montague v. Smith*,

(c) *Skinner v. Usher*, L. R. 17 Q. B. 688. And see sup.,
7 Q. B. 423; and see *Curtis v.* 334-351.

Embery, L. R. 7 Ex. 369. (f) *Cates v. Knight*, 3 T. R.

(d) See ex. gr. *R. v. South* 442, sup., 182-183.

confess judgment, if not filed within twenty-one days, "fraudulent and void against the assignees" in bankruptcy of the debtor, and another made it "void to all intents and purposes," if the defeasance was not written on the same paper as the warrant, it was held, notwithstanding the dissimilarity of the language, that the latter section was not more extensive than the former, but made the warrant of attorney void only as against the assignees (*a*). The 137th section of the Bankrupt Act of 1849, which made judges' orders, given by consent by a "trader," null and void to "all intents and purposes," unless filed, was held to have no more extensive meaning than the provision just cited of the 3 Geo. IV. c. 39. The word "trader," which is used in the same and the preceding sections, was held to be confined to traders who afterwards became bankrupt; though the word "bankrupt" was used in all the other sections relating to the subject. All of them, however, were prefaced by the preamble that they related to "transactions with the bankrupt" (*b*). Where under earlier bankruptcy statutes certain voluntary settlements could be avoided by an order for sale by a trustee in bankruptcy, and were thus voidable only, the enactment in s. 47 of the

(*a*) *Morris v. Mellin*, 6 B. & C. 446; *Bennett v. Daniel*, 10 B. & C. 500, diss. *Holroyd J. and Parke J.*; and *Rolfe* (*b*) *Bryan v. Child*, 1 L. M. B. in *Bryan v. Child*, 1 L. M. & P. 429. See also *Myers v.*

Veitch, L. R. 4 Q. B. 649, sup., 48; *R. v. Tone*, 1 B. & Ad. 561.

Bankruptcy Act, 1883, that such settlements should be "void" as against the trustee was construed as also merely rendering them voidable; the object of the Legislature being conceived to be unchanged, and the purpose of the alteration to be merely convenience in drafting (*a*).

A change of language effected by the omission in a later statute of words which occurred in an earlier one would make no difference in the sense, when the omitted words of the earlier enactment were unnecessary. Thus, where the first Act, after enacting that in an "indictment" for murder the manner or means of death need not be stated, superfluously provided that the term "indictment" should include "inquisition" (which it did *ex vi termini*, without any such provision (*b*)), and a subsequent consolidation Act repealed and re-enacted the same enactment, omitting the unnecessary interpretation clause; it was held that the word "indictment" was to be read in its full and established meaning, and not in the restricted sense in which the Legislature apparently understood it in the earlier statute (*c*). So, the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854, which required, following an earlier Act, that the transfer of ships

(*a*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 52; *Re v. R.*, 14 Q. B. D. 648; *Atty.-*
Brall, [1893] 2 Q. B. 377. *Gen. v. Bradlaugh*, 14 Q. B. D.

(*b*) 2 Hale, 155*; *Withipole's* 667.

Case, Cro. Car. 134. *Aliter* (*c*) *R. v. Ingham*, 5 B. & S.
 "information," *R. v. Slator*, 8 257.

Q. B. D. 267. See also *Yates*

should be registered, but omitted the proviso of the earlier, which declared that a transfer not registered should not be valid for any purpose whatever, was construed as making such a transfer void, notwithstanding the omission of the proviso (*a*). The 8 & 9 Vict. c. 106, which, after repealing a similar enactment of the preceding session, made certain leases void when not made by deed, was construed as leaving the unsealed document valid as an agreement; although the repealed Act had an express provision to that effect, which the repealing one omitted (*b*).

Even where the omitted words were material to the sense, but might be implied, the omission would not, in itself, be considered material, if leading to consequences not likely to be intended. Thus, although the Bankruptcy Act of 1869, in making an assignment by a debtor of all his property an act of bankruptcy, omitted the words "with intent to defeat or delay his creditors" which had been in former Acts, it was held that no alteration had been made in the law; for those words had been really superfluous and misleading (*c*). A statute which required witnesses before an election commission to answer self-criminating questions, and indemnified them from prosecution for

- | | |
|---|---|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Liverpool Borough Bank v. Turner</i> , 2 De G. F. & J. 502. | N. S. 298. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Bond v. Rosling</i> , 1 B. & S. 371; <i>Parker v. Taswell</i> , 2 De G. & J. 559; <i>per Byles J.</i> in <i>Tidey v. Mollett</i> , 16 C. B. | (<i>c</i>) <i>Re Wood</i> , L. R. 7 Ch. 302. See <i>Horn v. Ion</i> , 4 B. & Ad. 78. See also <i>Exp. Copeland</i> , 2 De G. M. & G. 914. |

l
l
a
tl
tl
ve

lat
we
om
nee
tha
me
pro
"in
any
Act
omit
was
in it
restri
under
Merch
follow

(a) 4
Brall, [1
(b) 2 1
Case, C
"informa
Q. B. D.

to the same word in the Mortmain Act, 9 Geo. II. c. 36 (a).

It is in this sense that the maxim, occasionally misapplied in argument (b), *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*, finds its true application.

When two or more words, susceptible of analogous meaning, are coupled together, *noscuntur a sociis*; they are understood to be used in their cognate sense. They take, as it were, their colour from each other; that is, the more general is restricted to a sense analogous to the less general. The expression, for instance, of "places of public resort," assumes a very different meaning when coupled with "roads and "streets," from that which it would have if the accompanying expression was "houses" (c). In an enactment respecting houses "for public refreshment, "resort and entertainment," the last word was understood, not as a theatrical or musical or other similar performance, but as something contributing to the

(a) *Walker v. Richardson*, 2 M. & W. 883. 833; *Exp. Freestone*, 25 L. J. M. C. 121; *Davys v. Douglas*,

(b) *Sup.*, 438. See *Feather v. R.*, 6 B. & S. 257; *Eastern Archip. Co. v. R.*, 1 E. & B. 310, *per* *Creswell J.*; *London Joint Stock Bank v. M. of London*, 1 C. P. D. 1, 17. 4 H. & N. 180; *Sewell v. Taylor*, 7 C. B. N. S. 160; *Case v. Storey*, L. R. 4 Ex. 319; *Skinner v. Usher*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 423. See also *R. v. Charlesworth*, 2 L. M. & P. 117;

(c) See *ex. gr. Re Jones*, 7 Ex. 586; *R. v. Brown*, 17 Q. B. 114. *Wilson v. Halifax*, L. R. 3 Ex.

the offences confessed, if the commissioners certified that they had answered the questions, was held not to differ substantially from an earlier one, which gave the indemnity only when it was certified that the answers were true. The Court shrank from inferring, from the mere dissimilarity of the terms of the two Acts, and though the omitted were material, the improbable intention, in the later one, to protect a witness who had answered, indeed, in point of fact, but had answered falsely or contemptuously (*a*).

It has, indeed, been said that, generally, statutes *in pari materiâ* ought to receive an uniform construction, notwithstanding any slight variations of phrase; the object and intention being the same (*b*). And it has been frequently laid down in America, that the mere change of phraseology is not to be deemed to alter the law (*c*). It would be difficult, at the present time, to give countenance to the doubt whether an Act which made it felony to steal "horses," in the plural, applied to the stealing of one horse, in consequence of an earlier Act having made it felony to steal "any horse" in the singular (*d*). The general language of a statute which repealed one of limited

(*a*) *R. v. Hulme*, L. R. 5 Q. B. 377. See *Duncan v. Tindall*, 13 C. B. 258; *Hughes v. Morris*, 2 De G. M. & G. 349; *McCalmont v. Rankin*, Id. 403; *Kennedy v. Gibson*, 8 Wallace 498, see *supra*, p. 352.

(*b*) *Per Cur.* in *Murray v. E. I. Co.*, 5 B. & Ald. 215, referring to the Statutes of Limitations.

(*c*) *Sedg. Interp. Stat.* 234, 428.

(*d*) 2 Hale, 365; *sup.*, 371.

operation, and re-enacted its provisions in an amended form, would be construed as equally limited in operation, unless an intention to extend it clearly appeared (*a*).

SECTION IV.—ASSOCIATED WORDS UNDERSTOOD IN A COMMON SENSE.

When two words or expressions are coupled together, one of which generally includes the other, it is obvious that the more general term is used in a meaning excluding the specific one. Though the words “cows,” “sheep,” and “horses,” for example, standing alone, comprehend heifers, lambs, and ponies respectively, they would be understood as excluding them if the latter words were coupled with them (*b*). The word “land,” which in its ordinary legal acceptance includes buildings standing upon it, is evidently used as excluding them, when it is coupled with the word “buildings” (*c*). If after imposing a rate on houses, buildings, works, tenements and hereditaments, an Act exempted “land,” this word would be restricted to land unburthened with houses, buildings, or works ; which would otherwise have been unnecessarily enume-

(*a*) *Per Cur. in Brown v. C. C.* 160.

McLachlan, L. R. 4 P. C. 543. (*c*) See *ex. gr. Dewhurst v.*

(*b*) *R. v. Cooke, 2 East, P. Feilden, 7 M. & Gr.* 182 ; *Peto C. 616 ; R. v. Loom, 1 Moo. v. West Ham, 2 E. & E.* 144.

rated (a). In the 43 Eliz. c. 43, which imposed a poor rate on the occupiers of "lands," houses, tithes, and "coal-mines," the same word was similarly limited in meaning as not including mines (b). The mention of one kind of mine shows that the Legislature understood the word "land," which in law comprehends all mines, as not including any.

In the same way, although the word "person," in the abstract, includes artificial persons, that is, corporations (c), the Statute of Uses, which enacts that when a "person" stands seised of tenements to the use of another "person or body corporate," the latter "person or body" shall be deemed to be seised of them, is understood as using the word "person" in the former part of the sentence as not including a body corporate. Consequently, the statute does not apply where the legal seisin is in a corporation (d). The same construction was given, for the same reason,

(a) *R. v. Midland R. Co.*, 4 Leach, 180; *St. Leonards' v. E. & B.* 958. *Franklin*, 3 C. P. D. 377;

(b) *Lead Smelting Co. v. Richardson*, 3 Burr. 1341; *R. v. Sedgley*, 2 B. & Ad. 65; *R. v. Cunningham*, 5 East, 478; *Morgan v. Crawshay*, L. R. 5 H. L. 304; *Thursby v. Briercliffe*, [1894] 2 Q. B. 11, [1895] A. C. 32. *Pharmaceutical Society v. London, etc., Supply Assoc.*, 5 App. Cas. 857. As to foreign corporations, *Ingate v. Austrian Lloyd's*, 4 C. B. N. S. 704; *Scott v. Royal Wax Co.*, 1 Q. B. D. 404; *Royal Mail Co. v. Braham*, 2 App. Cas. 381.

(c) 2 Inst. 722. See, however, *Weavers' Co. v. Forest*, 1 Stra. 1241; *Harrison's Case*, 1

(d) *Bac. Reading Stat. Uses*, 43, 57.

to the same word in the Mortmain Act, 9 Geo. II. c. 36 (a).

It is in this sense that the maxim, occasionally misapplied in argument (b), *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*, finds its true application.

When two or more words, susceptible of analogous meaning, are coupled together, *noscuntur a sociis*; they are understood to be used in their cognate sense. They take, as it were, their colour from each other; that is, the more general is restricted to a sense analogous to the less general. The expression, for instance, of "places of public resort," assumes a very different meaning when coupled with "roads and "streets," from that which it would have if the accompanying expression was "houses" (c). In an enactment respecting houses "for public refreshment, "resort and entertainment," the last word was understood, not as a theatrical or musical or other similar performance, but as something contributing to the

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(a) Walker v. Richardson, 2 M. & W. 883.</p> <p>(b) Sup., 438. See Feather v. R., 6 B. & S. 257; Eastern Archip. Co. v. R., 1 E. & B. 310, <i>per</i> Creswell J.; London Joint Stock Bank v. M. of London, 1 C. P. D. 1, 17.</p> <p>(c) See <i>ex. gr.</i> <i>Re Jones</i>, 7 Ex. 586; <i>R. v. Brown</i>, 17 Q. B.</p> | <p>833; <i>Exp. Freestone</i>, 25 L. J. M. C. 121; <i>Davys v. Douglas</i>, 4 H. & N. 180; <i>Sewell v. Taylor</i>, 7 C. B. N. S. 160; <i>Case v. Storey</i>, L. R. 4 Ex. 319; <i>Skinner v. Usher</i>, L. R. 7 Q. B. 423. See also <i>R. v. Charlesworth</i>, 2 L. M. & P. 117; <i>Wilson v. Halifax</i>, L. R. 3 Ex. 114.</p> |
|---|---|

enjoyment of the "refreshment" (*a*). An Act which exempted "magnates and noblemen" from tithes, was held, on this ground, not to extend to an ecclesiastical magnate, such as a dean, but to apply only to magnates of a "noble" kind (*b*).

In the same way, the 17th section of the Statute of Frauds, which requires that contracts for the sale of "goods, wares, and merchandise" for £10 or upwards, shall be in writing, and the Factors Act, 5 & 6 Vict. c. 39, which protects certain dealings of agents entrusted with the documents of title of "goods and merchandise," do not extend to shares or stock in companies (*c*), or to the certificates of them (*d*). In each of these cases, the meaning of the more general word is in a measure derived from, or at least limited by, the more specific one with which it is associated. The Bankrupt Act, which makes a fraudulent "gift, delivery, or transfer" of property an act of

(*a*) *Muir v. Keay*, L. R. 10 856.

Q. B. 594. See *Taylor v. Oram*, 1 H. & C. 370; *Howes v. Inland Revenue Bd.*, 1 Ex. D. 385; *R. v. Tucker*, 2 Q. B. D. 417.

(*b*) *Warden v. Dean of St. Paul's*, 4 Price, 65.

(*c*) *Tempest v. Kilner*, 3 C. B. 249; *Bowlby v. Ball*, Id. 284; *Humble v. Mitchell*, 11 A. & E. 205; *Heseltine v. Siggers*, 1 Ex.

(*d*) *Freeman v. Appleyard*, 32 L. J. Ex. 175. But see *Evans v. Davies*, [1893] 2 Ch. 216, where shares were held to be within the words "goods, wares, or merchandise" of R. S. C. 1833, Ord. 50, r. 2. No reference appears, however, to have been made to the principle under consideration, or to the foregoing authorities.

bankruptcy, includes only such deliveries or transfers as are of the nature of a gift; that is, such only as alter the ownership of the property; but it does not include a delivery to a bailee for safe custody (*a*).

In the provision of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, which authorises the Court to order a bankrupt to set aside a sum out of his "salary or income" towards payment of his debts, the latter word means income of the nature of salary, such as periodical payments under a contract for a theatrical engagement (*b*); but would not apply to wages (*c*); or earnings of a professional man (*d*).

The receipt of "parochial relief or other alms," which disqualifies for the municipal franchise (5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 76, s. 9), is confined to other parochial alms, and does not include alms received from a charitable institution (*e*). The ordinary marine policy which insures against arrest of "kings, princes, "and people," refers, under the last word, not to any collection of persons, but to the governing power of a country not included in the other terms with which it is associated (*f*).

(*a*) *Cotton v. James, Moo. & Mal. 273*; *Isitt v. Beeston, L. R. 4 Ex. 159*. 301. See *Re Rogers*, [1894] 1 Q. B. 245.

(*b*) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, s. 90; *Exp. Shine*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 522. 693. See the cases collected in *Harrison v. Carter*, 2 C. P. D.

(*c*) *Exp. Lloyd*, [1891] 2 Q. B. 231. 26.

(*d*) *Exp. Benwell*, 14 Q. B. D. T. R. 783. See *Johnson v. Nesbitt v. Lushington*, 4

In the Thames Conservancy Act, which, after empowering the conservators to license the construction of jetties in the river, provided that this should not take away any "right," claim, privilege, franchise, or immunity to which the occupiers of land on the banks were entitled, the word "right" was limited by the associated words to vested rights of property, and did not include the right of navigation which the occupiers enjoyed not otherwise than the public generally (*a*). In the 1st section of the Prescription Act, the expression "any right of common" is similarly restricted by the succeeding words, "or other profit or benefit to be taken and enjoyed from or upon any land," so as not to include rights in gross, but only those usual rights of common and profit à prendre which are in some way appurtenant to the land, and limited to the wants of a dominant tenement (*b*). And in the 2nd section of the same Act, relating to claims by custom, prescription or grant, "to any way or other easement," the only easements included are those analogous to a right of way, that is, rights of utility and benefit, and not merely of recreation and amuse-

Hogg, 10 Q. B. D. 432. See Williams v. Ellis, 5 Q. B. D. 175.
 also Davidson v. Burnand, L. R. (a) 20 & 21 Vict. c. cxlvii. s.
 4 C. P. 117; Ashbury Carriage 53; Kearns v. Cordwainers' Co.,
 Co. v. Riche, L. R. 7 H. L. 653; 6 C. B. N. S. 388.
 Chartered Merc. Bank v. Wilson, (b) 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 71;
 3 Ex. D. 108; Woodward v. Shuttleworth v. Le Fleming, 19
 London & N.W.R. Co., Id. 121; C. B. N. S. 687.

ment (a). An Act which made it felony to break and enter into a "dwelling, shop, warehouse, or "counting-house," would not include a workshop, but only that kind of shop which had some analogy with a warehouse; that is, one for the sale of goods (b). And a statutory prohibition of the conveyance of gunpowder into a mine except in a "case or canister" would prevent the use of a case, such as a linen bag, which is not of the same solid and substantial description as a canister (c). The wages of a collier are not within the meaning of the words "salary or income" of s. 53 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, as they are not "income" ejusdem generis with "salary" (d).

The County Courts Act, in making a person subject to the jurisdiction of the Court of the district within which he "dwells or carries on his business," included under the latter expression only a personal carrying on of business, not cases where it was carried on altogether by an agent (e). The 24 & 25 Vict. c. 10, s. 6, which gives the Admiralty jurisdiction, when the shipowner is not domiciled in

- | | |
|---|--|
| (a) 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 71, 429. | |
| Mounsey v. Imray, 3 H. & C. 486. See Webb v. Bird, 10 C. B. N. S. 268; 13 Id. 841. | (d) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 52, s. 53, sub-s. 2; Re Jones, [1891] 2 Q. B. 231. |
| (b) R. v. Sanders, 9 C. & P. 79. | (e) Minor v. London & N. W.R. Co., 26 L. J. C. P. 39; Shiels v. Rait, 7 C. B. 116. |
| (c) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 77, s. 23, sub-s. 2; Foster v. Diphwys Casson Slate Co., 18 Q. B. D. | Comp. Re Norria, 5 M. B. R. 11. |

England, over any claim of the owner of goods carried into any English port, for damage done to them by the negligence or misconduct of, or for "any breach of duty or of contract" by the ship-owner, master, or crew, seems confined to breaches of duty or contract having some analogy to what is provided in the earlier part of the section; and was therefore held not to apply to the wrongful refusal of a master to take a cargo to a port abroad (*a*).

On the same principle, an Act which prohibits the "taking or destroying" the spawn of fish would not include a "taking" of spawn for the purpose of removing it to another bed; for the word "destroying" with which "taking" is associated, indicates that the taking which is prohibited is dishonest or mischievous (*b*). And in an Act which made it penal to "take or kill" fish without the leave of the owners of the fishery, the same kind of "taking" was similarly held to have been intended (*c*). An Act which prohibits the "having or keeping" gunpowder, does not apply to a person who "has" gunpowder for a merely temporary purpose, as a carrier, the kind of "having" intended by the Act being explained by the word "keeping," with which it is associated (*d*). So, where

(*a*) *The Dannebrog*, L. R. 4 A. & E. 386.

(*b*) 3 Jac. I. c. 12; *Bridger v. Richardson*, 2 M. & S. 568.

(*c*) 22 & 23 Car. II. c. 25; *R. v. Mallinson*, 2 Burr. 679.

(*d*) 12 Geo. III. c. 61; *Biggs v. Mitchell*, 2 B. & S. 523; *R.*

v. Strugnell, L. R. 1 Q. B. 93.

See, however, *Shelley v. Bethell*,

12 Q. B. D. 11.

an Act punishes the "having or conveying" anything suspected of being stolen and not satisfactorily accounted for, the former expression is limited by the latter, and does not, therefore, apply to the possession of a house (*a*). An Act which made it felony to "cast away or destroy" a ship was held not to apply to a case where the ship was run aground or stranded upon a rock, but was afterwards got off in a condition capable of being refitted (*b*). This rule was applied to the construction of the repealed Act, 1 Vict. c. 85, which made it felony "to shoot, cut, stab, or wound;" for the latter term was held to be restricted, by the verbs which preceded it, to injuries inflicted by an instrument; and consequently to bite off a finger or a nose, or to burn the face with vitriol, was not to wound within the meaning of the Act (*c*).

One phrase or clause, in the same way, sometimes materially limits the effect of another with which it is similarly associated. Thus, an Act which disgavelled lands "to all intents and purposes," and then went on to make them "descendible as lands at common law," was held to disgorge them only for the purposes of descent (*d*). The section of the Annuity Act, 17 Geo. III. c. 26, which excepts from the general

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (a) 2 & 3 Vict. c. 71 ; Had- | 446 ; R. v. Stevens, 1 Moo. C. C. |
| ley v. Perks, L. R. 1 Q. B. 444. | 409 ; R. v. Murrow, Id. 456 ; |
| (b) De Londo's Case, 2 East, | Jenning's Case, 2 Lew. 130. |
| P. C. 1098. | (d) Wiseman v. Cotton, 1 Lev. |
| (c) R. v. Harris, 7 C. & P. | 79. |

provisions of the enactment any "voluntary annuity" "granted without regard to pecuniary consideration," was construed as using the word "voluntary," not in its usual legal sense, as without consideration, but as without pecuniary consideration (*a*).

SECTION V.—GENERIC WORDS FOLLOWING MORE
SPECIFIC.

It is, however, the use of a general word following (*b*) one or more less general terms ejusdem generis, which affords the most frequent illustration of the rule under consideration. *Generi per speciem derogatur*. In the abstract, general words, like all others, receive their full and natural meaning. If a right of hunting, shooting, and fishing is granted, all things generally hunted, shot, and fished are included (*c*). The 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 42, s. 3, which limits the time for suing "upon any bond or other "specialty," comprehends under the last expression every kind of specialty, including a statute (*d*). In such cases, the general principle applies, that the terms are to receive their plain and ordinary meaning; and Courts are not at liberty to impose on them

- | | |
|--|--|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Crespigny v. Wittenoom</i> , | <i>King v. George</i> , 5 Ch. D. 627. |
| 4 T. R. 790. See <i>Blake v.</i> | (<i>c</i>) <i>Jeffreys v. Evans</i> , 19 C. B. |
| <i>Attersoll</i> , 2 B. & C. 875; <i>Evatt</i> | N. S. 264. |
| <i>v. Hunt</i> , 2 E. & B. 374. | (<i>d</i>) <i>Cork & Bandon R. Co. v.</i> |
| (<i>b</i>) Not preceding; see <i>ex. gr.</i> | <i>Goode</i> , 13 C. B. 836. |

limitations not called for by the sense, or the objects or mischief of the enactment (*a*).

But the general word which follows particular and specific words of the same nature as itself takes its meaning from them, and is presumed to be restricted to the same genus as those words (*b*): or, in other words, as comprehending only things of the same kind as those designated by them; unless, of course, there be something to show that a wider sense was intended.

Thus, the Sunday Act, 29 Car. II. c. 7, which enacts that "no tradesman, artificer, workman, labourer, "or other person whatsoever, shall do or exercise any "labour, business, or work of their ordinary callings "upon the Lord's Day," has been held not to include a coach proprietor (*c*), or a farmer (*d*), or, no doubt, an attorney (*e*); the word "person" being confined to those of callings like those specified by the preceding words. For a similar reason, the 20 Geo. II. c. 19, which empowers justices to determine differences between masters and "servants in husbandry, "artificers, handicraftsmen," and persons in some other specific employments, and "all other labourers," does not include a domestic servant (*f*), or a man

(*a*) *Per Cur. in U. S. v. Coombs*, 12 Peters, 80.

(*b*) See *per Willes J. in Fenwick v. Schmalz*, L. R. 3 C. P. 313.

(*c*) *Sandiman v. Breach*, 7 B. & C. 96.

(*d*) *R. v. Cleworth*, 4 B. & S. 927; *R. v. Silvester*, 33 L. J.

M. C. 79 S. C.

(*e*) *Peate v. Dicken*, 1 C. M. & R. 422.

(*f*) *Kitchen v. Shaw*, 6 A. & E. 729. *Comp. Exp. Hughes*,

employed to take care of goods seized under a writ (a); for though in the abstract they may be "labourers," their employments have no analogy with those specified. It would include, however, a man who contracted to work by the piece, not by the day, provided the relation of master and servant existed (b).

The Metropolitan Building Act of 1855, which entitles a district surveyor "or other person," to a month's notice of action for anything done under the Act, was held, on this principle, not to give that privilege to every person sued, but to give it only to persons ejusdem generis with a district surveyor; that is, having an official duty (c). And s. 75 of the Larceny Act, 1861, which makes it a misdemeanour for any "banker, merchant, broker, "attorney, or other agent" to convert to his own use any valuable security entrusted to him for any special purpose, does not under the words "or other agent" include any ordinary agent who may from time to

23 L. J. M. C. 138; *Davies v. East*, 113; comp. *Lancaster v. Berwick*, 3 E. & E. 549; *Greaves*, 9 B. & C. 628; *Exp. Morgan v. London Gen. Omnibus Johnson*, 7 Dowl. 702; *R. v. Co.*, 13 Q. B. D. 832. But see *Heywood*, 1 M. & S. 624. See also *Gordon v. Jennings*, 9 Q. B. D. 45.

[1892] 1 Q. B. 226. See also (c) *Williams v. Golding*, L. R. 1 C. P. 69. Comp. *Newton v. Ellis*, 5 E. & B. 115. And see contra *Driffeld Co. v. Waterloo Co.*, 31 Ch. D. 638.

(a) *Branwell v. Penneck*, 7 B. & C. 536.

(b) *Lowther v. Radnor*, 8

time be entrusted with valuable securities, but only persons whose occupation is similar to those specifically enumerated (*a*). In an Act imposing a penalty on unqualified persons navigating "any wherry, lighter, "or other craft," the last word would include only vessels of the same kind as wherries and lighters, not steam tugs which carried neither passengers nor goods (*b*). But the same word would be more comprehensive if it had followed "boats and vessels" (*c*). A prohibition against deducting from an artificer's wages any part of them "for frame rent and standing, "or other charges," would not include, under the last word, a fine incurred for breach of agreement (*d*).

The 11 Geo. II. c. 19, which authorises the distress for rent of "corn, grass, or other product" growing on the demised lands, includes only products similar to grass and corn; but not young trees, which, though unquestionably products of the land, are of a different character from the products specified by the earlier terms (*e*). For the same reason, young trees are not included in the Act which punishes the stealing of "any plant, root, fruit, or vegetable production growing in a garden, nursery-ground, hot-house "or conservatory" (*f*).

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| (<i>a</i>) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 52; R. | (<i>d</i>) Willis v. Thorp, L. R. 10 |
| v. De Portugal, 16 Q. B. D. 487; | Q. B. 383. |
| R. v. Prince, 2 C. & P. 517. | (<i>e</i>) Clark v. Gaskarth, 8 |
| (<i>b</i>) Read v. Ingham, 3 E. & | Taunt. 431. |
| B. 889. | (<i>f</i>) R. v. Hodges, 1 Moo. |
| (<i>c</i>) Tisdell v. Combe, 7 A. | & M. 341. See Radnorshire |
| & E. 788. | Bd. v. Evans, 3 B. & S. 400; |

An Act which prohibited playing or betting in the streets "at or with any table or instrument of gaming," would not include, under the last general words, half-pence used for tossing for money (*a*). A bye-law which imposed a penalty for causing an obstruction in the street in various specified ways, all of a temporary character, or otherwise causing or committing "any other obstruction, nuisance, or annoyance" in any of the streets, was held not to include, under the latter words, any obstruction which was not of a temporary character (*b*).

The enactment which prohibited the establishment, without license, of "the business of a blood boiler, bone boiler, fellmonger, slaughterer of cattle, horses, or animals of any description, soap boiler, tallow melter, tripe boiler, or other noxious or offensive business, trade, or manufacture," was held not to include under the final general terms any employments not connected, as all the specified trades were, with animal matter; and so did not reach brick-making (*c*), nor a small-pox hospital (*d*).

A bill of sale, by the yearly tenant of a dwelling-
Smith *v.* Barnham, 1 Ex. D. (*b*) R. *v.* Dickenson, 7 E. &
419. B. 831.

(*a*) Watson *v.* Martin, 34 L. J. M. C. 50, rectified by 31 & 32 Vict. c. 52, s. 3; Hirst *v.* Molesbury, L. R. 6 Q. B. 130. (*c*) 11 & 12 Vict. c. 63, s. 64; Wanstead Board *v.* Hill, 13 C. B. N. S. 479.
But see R. *v.* O'Connor, 15 Cox, 3. (*d*) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55; Withington L. Bd. *v.* Manchester Corp., [1892] 2 Ch. 19.

house, of all the household goods, furniture, and other household effects in and about the dwelling-house, "and all other the personal estate whatsoever," of the assignor, was held not to pass his term or interest in the house (a). So, a will, which, after enumerating in a bequest furniture, plate, linen, china, and pictures, added "all other goods, chattels, and effects "which shall be in the house" at the time of the testator's death, did not include a sum of money then in the house (b). And the rules of an industrial society, established to carry on the business of general dealers, farmers, and manufacturers, which provided that the profits of the business should be applied either to increase the capital, reserve fund, or business of the society, "or to any lawful purpose," and that the remainder, less any grant that might be made for educational purposes, should be divided among the members, have been held not to authorise a subscription to a strike fund, that not being a lawful purpose ejusdem generis with increasing the capital, reserve fund, or business of the society (c).

An Act which gives a vote to the occupier of a "house, warehouse, counting-house, shop, or other "building," includes, in the latter term, only buildings

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) <i>Harrison v. Blackburn</i> , 17 | <i>Fitzgerald</i> , 50 L. J. Ch. 9. |
| C. B. N. S. 678; comp. <i>Ringer</i> | (c) <i>Warburton v. Hudders-</i> |
| <i>v. Cann</i> , 3 M. & W. 343. | field Industrial Socy., [1892] |
| (b) <i>Gibbs v. Lawrence</i> , 30 | 1 Q. B. 817. |
| L. J. Ch. 170; <i>Bridgeman v.</i> | |

which, like those specifically mentioned, are of some permanence and utility, and contribute to the beneficial occupation of the land, increasing thereby its value (a). The words "tenements and hereditaments," which, in their technical sense, embrace not only every species of right connected with land, such as rents, tithe, rights of common, seignorial rights, but also, offices, have been confined to habitable structures, when coupled with and following such words as "houses, warehouses, and shops" (b). Where an Act authorised the police to enter any house or room used for stage plays, and imposed a penalty for keeping any house or other "tenement" as an unlicensed theatre; it was held that the word "tenement" was confined in meaning to something of the same character as "house" or "room," and so did not include a portable booth, consisting of two waggons joined together, and used as a theatre by strolling players (c).

The 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 90, s. 33, which enacted

(a) *Powell v. Boraston*, 18 C. B. N. S. 175; and see *Chelsea Waterworks v. Bowley*, 17 Q. B. 358; *Metrop. Ry. v. Morish v. Harris*, L. R. 1 C. P. 155. *Comp. Hodgson v. Jex*, 2 Ch. D. 122; *Chapman v. Chapman*, 4 Id. 800.

(b) *R. v. Manchester Waterworks Co.*, 1 B. & C. 630; *East London Waterworks Co. v. Mile End*, 17 Q. B. 512. See also *R. v. Midland R. Co.*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 389; *Fredericks v. Howie*, 1 H. & C. 381. *Comp. R. v. Midland R. Co.*, 4 E. & B. 958; *Day v. Simpson*, 18 C. B. N. S. 680, sup., p. 160.

that the owners of "houses, buildings, and property other than land," rateable to the poor, should be rated at thrice the rate imposed on the owners of land, was held confined to that kind of "property other than land," which was ejusdem generis with "houses and buildings," and that a railway, a canal, with its towing-paths, and a dry dock lined with masonry, which were its accessories, were not comprised in the expression, but were rateable as land (*a*). On the same principle, the Companies Act of 1862, which provides (s. 79) that a company may be wound up by the Court of Chancery when the company passes a resolution in favour of that course, or does not begin business within a year, or its members are reduced to less than seven, or when the Court thinks a winding-up "just and equitable," empowers the Court by these last general words to wind up only when it is just and equitable on grounds analogous to those precedingly stated (*b*).

Of course, the restricted meaning which primarily attaches to the general word, in such circumstances, is rejected when there are adequate grounds to show that it was not used in the limited order of ideas to which its predecessors belong. If it can be seen from

(*a*) *R. v. Neath*, L. R. 6 Q. B. Langham Rink Co., 5 Ch. D. 669.
707. See under The Apportionment

(*b*) *Spackman's Case*, 1 McN. Act of 1870, *Re Cox's Trusts*, 9
& G. 170; *Re Anglo-Greek* Ch. D. 159.
Steam Co., L. R. 2 Eq. 1; *Re*

a wider inspection of the scope of the legislation that the general words, notwithstanding that they follow particular words, are nevertheless to be construed generally, effect must be given to the intention of the Legislature as gathered from the larger survey. Upon this principle it has been held that, having regard to the object of s. 32 of the Patents Act, 1883, as seen on a consideration of the whole section, and the law existing at the time of its enactment, in construing the reference to threats of legal proceedings "by circulars, advertisements, or otherwise," which it contains, the words "or otherwise" are not to be restricted to threats by measures ejusdem generis with circulars or advertisements, but are to be regarded as extending the previous words, so as absolutely to prohibit any threats whatever of legal proceedings by a patentee for the infringement of his patent, unless they are followed up speedily by an action (*a*). And where an inspector of nuisances was authorised to inspect articles of food deposited in "any place" for sale, and a penalty was imposed on persons who prevented him from entering any "slaughter-house, "shop, building, market, or other place," where any carcase was deposited for sale; it was held that the latter word was not confined to places ejusdem generis with those which preceded it. The earlier passage, giving authority to enter "any place," obviously re-

(*a*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 57; [1892] 1 Ch. 413.
Skinner & Co. v. Shaw & Co., ;

quired that the same word should receive an equally extensive meaning in the subsequent passage (*a*). The 103rd section of the Public Health Act of 1848, which imposes a penalty for making any "sewer, " drain, privy, cesspool, ashpit, building, or other work, " contrary to the provisions of the Act," would include, under the word "building," not only constructions of a character similar to those previously mentioned, but also dwelling-houses (*b*).

When justices, empowered to prepare a standard for an equal county rate, were authorised for this purpose to direct overseers, assessors of rates, and other persons having the management of the rates or valuations, to make returns of the annual value of the property in the parish, and to require "the said overseers, assessors, collectors, and any other persons "whomsoever," to produce parochial and other rates and valuations, "and other documents in their custody "or power," the context showed that the final generic expression was not confined to official, but extended to private persons (*c*). So, where an Act imposed a rate on a variety of tenements and buildings which were enumerated, and on "other buildings and hereditaments, meadow and pasture excepted," the exception appended to the concluding general words

- (*a*) *Young v. Grattridge*, L. R. & C. 921. See *Morish v. Harris*, 4 Q. B. 166. See also *Harris v. L. R.* 1 C. P. 155.
Jenns, 9 C. B. N. S. 152. (*c*) *R. v. Doubleday*, 3 E. &
 (*b*) *Pearson v. Kingston*, 3 H. E. 501.

showed that the latter were used in their widest sense, and were not limited in meaning by the particular terms which preceded them (*a*).

Further, the general principle in question applies only where the specific words are all of the same nature. Where they are of different genera, the meaning of the general word remains unaffected by its connection with them. Thus, where an Act made it penal to convey to a prisoner, in order to facilitate his escape, "any mask, dress, or disguise, "or any letter, or any other article or thing," it was held that the last general terms were to be understood in their primary and wide meaning, and as including any article or thing whatsoever which could in any manner facilitate the escape of a prisoner, such as a crowbar (*b*). Here, the several particular words "disguise" and "letter," exhausted whole genera; and the last general words must be understood, therefore, as referred to other genera.

The general object of the Act, also, sometimes requires that the final generic word shall not be restricted in meaning by its predecessors. Thus, the 17 Geo. III. c. 56, which, after reciting that stolen materials used in certain manufactures were often concealed in the possession of persons who had received them with guilty knowledge, and that the

(*a*) *R. v. Shrewsbury*, 3 B. & Ad. 216. 27. See also *Shillito v. Thompson*, 1 Q. B. D. 12.

(*b*) *R. v. Payne*, L. R. 1 C. C.

discovery and conviction of the offenders was in consequence difficult, proceeded to authorise justices to issue search warrants for purloined materials suspected to be concealed "in any dwelling-house, out-house, yard, garden, or other place," was held to include, under the last word, a warehouse which was a mile and a half from the dwelling-house (*a*). Though such a warehouse would probably not be usually considered as *ejusdem generis* with a "dwelling-house," coupled with its enumerated dependencies, it was reasonable, having regard to the preamble and the general object of the statute, to think that the warehouse was within the contemplation of the Legislature, as it was a very likely place for the concealment against which the enactment was directed; and a narrower construction would have restricted the effect, instead of promoting the object of the Act. The requirement of the Municipal Corporations Act, 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 76, s. 32, that voting papers should be signed by the voter, and state the name of the "street, lane, or place," in which the property was situated in respect of which he claimed to vote, was considered satisfied by a statement of the parish where the property lay; the object of the provision being, apparently, the identification of the voter (*b*).

Several decisions on a recent enactment are instruc-

(*a*) *R. v. Edmundson*, 2 E. & Crompton J. in *R. v. Spratley*, E. 77. 6 E. & B. 363. See *Lowther*

(*b*) *Per Lord Campbell and v. Bentinck*, L. R. 19 Eq. 166.

tive examples of the application of the above-mentioned rules, as to the effect of words of analogous meaning on each other, and of specific words on the more general one, which closes the enumeration of them; as well as of their subordination to the more general principle of gathering the intention from a review of the whole enactment, and giving effect to its paramount object. The 16 & 17 Vict. c. 119, after reciting that a kind of gaming had lately sprung up, to the demoralisation of improvident persons, by opening places called betting-houses or offices, enacts, for the better suppression of them, that any person who, being "the owner or occupier of any house, office, "room, or place," should "open, keep, or use," or "knowingly permit" it to be used for the purposes of betting, should be liable to a penalty of £50, and to an action for the recovery of any deposit made with him in respect of the bet. The Court of Common Pleas held that a man who habitually resorted to a certain spot under a tree in Hyde Park, and there made bets, occupied a "place" within the meaning of the Act. Although that general word was used with specific ones which involved the idea of structure, the mischief aimed at, which was to prevent skilled persons using a well-known place for inducing improvident persons to bet, was equally great whether under a tree or in a room (a). This decision was reversed by the Exchequer Chamber

(a) *Doggett v. Catterns*, 17 C. B. N. S. 669.

on the ground, chiefly, that the defendant could not be said to be the "occupier" of the place; as that expression derived a meaning from the one with which it was coupled, which implied some legal and exclusive title to the place (*a*). But a temporary wooden structure, erected on a piece of ground rented by the person who used it for betting purposes, though unroofed and not fixed to the soil, was afterwards held to be a "place" within the Act (*b*); and in another case, a man who carried on the same business, standing on a stool sheltered under a large umbrella on which was printed an indication of the business, was held to be the "occupier of a place" within the Act; as he had in fact appropriated it for his proceedings, though he paid no rent and had no greater right to stand on the spot than any others of the public who were admitted (*c*). In another case a piece of enclosed land of about four acres was considered a "place" within the Act (*d*).

Analogous to the rules above considered is another, that when words descriptive of the rank of persons or things are used in a descending order according to

- | | |
|---|--|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Id.</i> , 19 C. B. N. S. 765. | (<i>d</i>) <i>Eastwood v. Miller</i> , L. R. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Shaw v. Morley</i> , L. R. 3 | 9 Q. B. 440. <i>Comp. Snow v.</i> |
| Ex. 137. | <i>Hill</i> , 14 Q. B. D. 588. See |
| (<i>c</i>) <i>Bows v. Fenwick</i> , L. R. 9 | also, in connection with similar |
| C. P. 339. See a similar case, | enactments, <i>Langrish v. Archer</i> , |
| <i>Galloway v. Maries</i> , 8 Q. B. D. | 10 Q. B. D. 44; <i>Taylor v.</i> |
| 275. | <i>Smetten</i> , 11 Q. B. D. 287. |

rank, the general words superadded to them do not include (though standing alone they would do so) persons or things of a higher rank or importance than the highest named, if there be any lower species to which they can apply. In such a case, the general word is taken not as generic, but as including only what is lower in the genus than the lowest specified. Thus, the 13 Eliz. c. 10, s. 3, which avoided conveyances by masters and fellows of colleges, deans and chapters of cathedrals, parsons, vicars, and "others having any spiritual or ecclesiastical living," does not include bishops (*a*).

The Statute of Marlbridge, 52 Hen. III. c. 29, also, which gave a right of action in certain cases to "abbots, priors, and other prelates of the Church," did not, according to Lord Coke, include bishops; because, among other reasons, the bishop is of a higher degree than an abbot (*b*). It may be presumed that there were prelates of a lower degree than abbots and priors, otherwise the generic expression so construed would have been without effect. To avoid this the rule in question would be rejected, and the general term would receive its full and natural meaning, and include the higher denominations (*c*). Duties imposed, under the general head of "metals,"

(*a*) The Abp. of Canterbury's Case, 2 Rep. 46b; Copland v. Powell, 1 Bing. 373; Cope v. Barber, L. R. 7 C. P. 393.

(*b*) 2 Inst. 151, 457, 478; 2 Rep. 46b.
(*c*) 2 Inst. 137.

upon "copper, brass, pewter, and tin, and on all "other metals not enumerated," would not include the higher metals of gold or silver, which are commonly known as precious metals (*a*).

The 22 & 23 Car. II. c. 25, which empowered the lords of "manors and other royalties" to grant a deputation to a gamekeeper, was limited to the lords of such royalties as are inferior to manors; for if a royalty of a higher nature had been meant, it would have preceded the term "manor" (*b*).

The 2 Westm. c. 47, which prohibited salmon-fishing from Lady-day to St. Martin's, in "the waters "of the Humber, Owse, Trent, Done, Arre, Derewent, "Werfe, Nid, Yore, Swale, Tese, Tine, Eden, and "all other waters wherein salmons be taken," was considered as including, in the final general expression, only rivers inferior to those enumerated, and therefore as not comprising nobile illud flumen, the Thames (*c*). It does not appear whether the rivers specified were named in order of descending importance. An Act which punished cruelty to any "horse, mare, gelding, "mule, ass, ox, cow, heifer, sheep, or other cattle," was held not to include a bull (*d*).

It was, indeed, once thought that in the 14 Geo. II. c. 6, which made it a capital felony to steal sheep or

(*a*) *Casher v. Holmes*, 2 B. & Stevens, 4 T. R. 224, 459.

Ad. 592; *per Parke B.* (*c*) 2 Inst. 478.

(*b*) *Ailesbury v. Pattison*, (*d*) *Exp. Hill*, 3 C. & P. 1 Doug. 28. See also *Evans v.* 225.

"other cattle," this last expression was "much too loose" to include any other cattle than those already specified, viz., sheep; but this extreme strictness of construction may be, perhaps, best attributed to the excessive severity of the law in question (*a*).

A statute which spoke of indictments before justices of the peace and "others having power to take indictments," was understood, on the general ground under consideration, as not applying to the Superior Courts (*b*). But the 11 & 12 Vict. c. 42, which authorises justices of the peace to inquire into indictable offences committed on the high seas or abroad, and to bind the witnesses to appear at the next "court of oyer and terminer, or jail delivery, or superior court of a County Palatine, or the Quarter Sessions," would authorise a justice to hold an inquiry into an offence committed by a Colonial Governor in his colony, which is triable by the Queen's Bench. That court was included in the words, "court of oyer and terminer" (*c*).

SECTION VI.—MEANING OF SOME PARTICULAR EXPRESSIONS.

It may be convenient to mention, in conclusion, the meaning in which a few words and expressions in frequent use in statutes are, in general, understood.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| (<i>a</i>) 1 Bl. Comm. 88. | Comp. | Wright <i>v.</i> Pearson, L. R. 4 Q. B. |
| Child <i>v.</i> Hearn, L. R. 9 Ex. | 582. | |
| 176; Fletcher <i>v.</i> Sondes, 3 Bing. | (<i>b</i>) 2 Rep. 46b. | |
| 580; R. <i>v.</i> Paty, 2 W. Bl. 721; | (<i>c</i>) R. <i>v.</i> Eyre, L. R. 3 Q. B. 487. | |

Unless the contrary intention appears, in statutes passed after 1850, words importing the masculine gender include females, the singular includes the plural, and the plural the singular; the word "county" means also county of a town or of a city; the word "land" includes messuages, tenements, and hereditaments, houses, and buildings of any tenure; the words "oath," "swear," and "affidavit," include affirmation, declaration, affirming and declaring, in the case of persons by law allowed to declare or affirm, instead of swearing; and the word "month" means calendar month (*a*). But "six months" may sometimes mean the period between two feast days, as between Michaelmas and Lady-day (*b*). Half a year consists of one hundred and eighty-two, and a quarter of ninety-one days (*c*).

Expressions of time in an Act of Parliament mean (unless it is otherwise specifically stated) in Great Britain, Greenwich mean time, and in Ireland, Dublin mean time (*d*). In the computation of time, distinctions have been made by the Courts which were founded chiefly on considerations of convenience and justice. The general rule, anciently, seems to have been that both terms or endings of the period given

(*a*) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, ss.
1, 3, 4.

(*b*) See *Morgan v. Davies*, 3
C. P. D. 260.

(*c*) Co. Litt. 135b; 6 Rep.
61b; Cro. Jac. 167.

(*d*) 43 & 44 Vict. c. 9.

for doing or suffering something were included; but when a penalty or forfeiture was involved in non-compliance with a condition within the given time, the time was reckoned by including one and excluding the other of the terminal days (*a*). A distinction was afterwards made, depending on whether the point from which the computation was to be made was an act to which the person against whom the time ran, was privy or not. Thus, if the time ran "from" when he was arrested, or received a notice of action, it might justly be computed as including the day of that event; but not so, if it ran from the death of another person (*b*); a fact of which he would not, as in the previous cases, necessarily be cognizant. But it has also been laid down that when a period of time allowed to a person is included between the dates of two acts to be done by another person, as where it is enacted that no action shall be brought against a justice until notice of the intention to bring it has been given to him a month before the writ is issued, both the terminal days are to be excluded (*c*). The notice

(*a*) De Morgan, *Comp. Alm.* cited in Sir G. C. Lewis' *Obs. and Reas. in Politics*, Vol. I, 387n.

(*b*) *Per* Sir T. Grant in *Lester v. Garland*, 15 Ves. 248; *per* Parke B. in *Young v. Higgon*, 6 M. & W. 53; *Newman v. Hardwicke*, 3 Nev. & P. 368. Insurance against accidents for

twelve months "from" Nov. 24th, 1887, covers an accident occurring on Nov. 24th, 1888; *South Staffordshire Tramways Co. v. The Sickness and Accident Assurance Association*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 402.

(*c*) *Per* Alderson B. in *Young v. Higgon*, 6 M. & W. 53. See

having been given on the 28th of April, the action, it was held, was rightly brought on the 29th of May; what was requisite was that two days of the same number should not be comprised in the computation (a).

Again, when so many "clear days" (b), or so many days "at least" (c), are given to do an act, or "not less than" so many days are to intervene, both the terminal days are excluded from the computation (d). In other cases, it would seem, the rule is to exclude the first and include the last day (e).

When a statute requires that something shall be done "forthwith," or "immediately," or even "instantly," it would probably be understood as allowing a reasonable time for doing it (f). An application

Pellew v. Wonford, 9 B. & C. 134; Blunt v. Heslop, 3 Nev. & P. 553; R. v. West Riding, 4 B. & Ad. 685; Weeks v. Wray, L. R. 3 Q. B. 312.

(a) Freeman v. Read, 4 B. & S. 174. See also Webb v. Fairmarer, 3 M. & W. 473; R. v. Price, 8 Moo. P. C. 203; Migotti v. Colville, 4 C. P. D. 233; Re Southam, 19 Ch. D. 169.

(b) Liffin v. Pitcher, 6 Jur. 537. See Walker v. Crystal Palace Gas Co., [1891] 2 Q. B. 300.

(c) Zouch v. Empsey, 4 B. & A. 522; R. v. Salop, 8 A. & E. 173.

(d) Re Railway Sleepers Co., 29 Ch. D. 204; Robinson v. Waddington, 18 L. J. Q. B. 250.

(e) See Chit. Archb. Pr. pp. 1434-5, 14th ed.; Radcliffe v. Bartholomew, [1892] 1 Q. B. 161; Williams v. Burgess, 12 A. & E. 635.

(f) See Toms v. Wilson, 4 B. & S. 455; Brighty v. Norton, 3 B. & S. 310; Forsdike v. Stone, L. R. 3 C. P. 607; per Cockburn C.J. in Griffith v.

to deprive a plaintiff of costs, which must be made "at the trial," was deemed made in time, when made an hour after the trial was over, and the judge was trying another cause (*a*).

If the statute require some act to be done periodically and recurrently once in a certain space of time, as, for instance, the inspection of the boilers of steamers once in six months, it would probably be understood to mean that not more than six months should elapse between the two acts. It would not be satisfied by dividing the year into two equal periods, and doing the act once in the beginning of the first, and once at the end of the second period (*b*). An Act which imposed a penalty for absence for more than a certain time in any one year, means not a calendar year computed from the first of January, but a year computed back from the day when the action for the penalty was brought (*c*).

It used to be laid down as a general rule that Courts refused to take notice of the fraction of a day, for the uncertainty, which is always the mother of

Taylor, 2 C. P. D. 202; Massey v. Sladen, L. R. 4 Ex. 13; R. v. Aston, 1 L. M. & P. 491. Comp. Exp. Sillence, 47 L. J. Bkcy. 87; Gibbs v. Stead, 8 B. & C. 533; Tennant v. Bell, 9 Q. B. 684; Lowe v. Fox, 15 Q. B. D. 667.

(*a*) Jud. A. 1875, Ord. 53;

Kynaston v. Mackinder, 47 L. J. Q. B. 76. See also Page v. Pearce, 8 M. & W. 677. Comp. R. v. Berks, 4 Q. B. D. 469.

(*b*) Virginia & Maryland St. Nav. Co. v. U. S., Taney & Campbell's Maryland Rep. 418.

(*c*) Cathcart v. Hardy, 2 M.

& S. 534.

confusion and contention (*a*); and in civil cases, a judicial act, such as a judgment, is taken conclusively to have been done at the first moment of the day (*b*). But as regards the acts of parties, including in this expression acts which, though in form judicial, are in reality the acts of parties, the Courts do notice such fractions, whenever it is necessary to decide which of two events first happened (*c*). Thus, they will notice the hour when a party issued a writ of summons, or filed a bill, or delivered a declaration, or the sheriff seized goods (*d*). A person who was keeping a dog at noon without a license would not escape from conviction by procuring a license at one p.m. (*e*). Where the title of the Crown and of the subject accrue on the same day, the title of the Crown is preferred (*f*).

Sundays are included in computations of time, ex-

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) Clayton's Case, 5 Rep. 1b.</p> <p>(<i>b</i>) Shelley's Case, 1 Rep. 93b; Wright v. Mills, 4 H. & N. 488.</p> <p>(<i>c</i>) <i>Per</i> Grove J. in Campbell v. Strangeways, 3 C. P. D. 105; <i>per</i> Lord Mansfield in Combe v. Pitt, 3 Burr. 1434; <i>per</i> Patte-son J. in Chick v. Smith, 8 Dowl. 337; <i>per</i> Cur. in Edwards v. Reg., 9 Ex. 628; Thomas v. Desanges, 2 B. & A. 586; Sadler v. Leigh, 4 Camp. 197; Wood-land v. Fuller, 11 A. & E. 859;</p> | <p>Tomlinson v. Bullock, 4 Q. B. D. 230; Clarke v. Bradlaugh, 8 Q. B. D. 63. See further p. 594.</p> <p>(<i>d</i>) 2 Lev. 141, 176; and <i>per</i> Cur. in Edwards v. Reg., 9 Ex. 628.</p> <p>(<i>e</i>) Campbell v. Strangeways, 3 C. P. D. 107.</p> <p>(<i>f</i>) Atty.-Gen. v. Capell, 2 Show. 481; R. v. Giles, 8 Pri. 293; Giles v. Grover, 9 Bing. 128; Edwards v. R., 9 Ex. 628.</p> |
|---|---|

cept when the time is limited to twenty-four hours, in which case the following day is allowed (*a*). Thus, where an Act required that a recognizance should be entered into in two days after notice of appeal, and the notice was given on a Friday, it was held that recognizances on the following Monday were too late; though Sunday was the last day, and they could not be entered into then (*b*). Of course, when an Act expressly excludes Sunday, the days given for doing an act are working days only (*c*).

A continuing act, such as trespass or imprisonment, dates, in the computation of the time allowed for bringing an action in respect of it, from the day of its termination (*d*). So, a bankrupt remaining abroad with intent to defeat his creditors commits a fresh act of bankruptcy every day (*e*).

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Burn's J., Tit. Lord's Day.</i></p> <p>(<i>b</i>) <i>Exp. Simpkin</i>, 2 E. & E. 392; <i>Peacock v. Reg.</i>, 4 C. B. N. S. 264.</p> <p>(<i>c</i>) <i>Pease v. Norwood</i>, L. R. 4 C. P. 235; <i>Exp. Hicks</i>, L. R. 20 Eq. 143.</p> <p>(<i>d</i>) <i>Massy v. Johnson</i>, 12 East, 67; <i>Hardy v. Ryle</i>, 9 B. & C. 603; <i>Collins v. Rose</i>, 5 M. & W. 194; <i>Pease v. Chaytor</i>, 3 B. & S. 620; <i>Whitehouse v. Fellowes</i>, 10 C. B. N. S. 765. As to subsidence, see <i>Darley Main Colliery Co. v. Mitchell</i>,</p> | <p>11 App. Cas. 127; <i>Crumbie v. Wallsend Loc. Bd.</i>, [1891] 1 Q. B. 503. See, however, <i>Wallace v. Blackwell</i>, 3 Drew. 538; <i>Eggington v. Lichfield</i>, 5 E. & B. 100. As to continuing nuisance, see cases in <i>Battishill v. Reed</i>, 18 C. B. 696, and <i>Whitehouse v. Fellowes</i>, 10 C. B. N. S. 765. Encroachment, <i>Coggins v. Bennett</i>, 2 C. P. D. 568; <i>Rumball v. Schmidt</i>, 8 Q. B. D. 603.</p> <p>(<i>e</i>) <i>Exp. Bunny</i>, 1 De Gex & J. 309.</p> |
|--|---|

Distances were formerly measured by the nearest and most usual road or way (*a*); and this is undoubtedly the popular manner of measuring them (*b*). But if the nearest practicable mode of access were adopted, should it be a carriage-way, or a bridle-path, or a footpath? If the way were by a tidal river, the distance might vary every hour of the day (*c*). Unless a contrary intention appears, distances will in future be measured in a straight line on a horizontal plane (*d*).

In the Interpretation Act, 1889, and every subsequent Act, the expression "person," unless the contrary intention appears, includes any body of persons corporate or unincorporate (*e*), and the same expression includes any body corporate in the construction of any previous enactment relating to an offence punishable on indictment or summary conviction (*f*).

In every Act expressions referring to writing, unless the contrary intention appears, are to be construed as including references to printing, lithography, photography, and other modes of representing or reproducing words in a visible form (*g*).

In every Act subsequent to 1866, unless the

(*a*) 1 Hawk. 54. Comp. 23 9 Q. B. 76; *Duignan v. Walker*,
L. J. C. P. 144n. Johns. 446; *Mouflet v. Cole*,

(*b*) *Per Coleridge J. in Lake* L. R. 8 Ex. 32; *Coulbert v.*
v. Butler, 5 E. & B. 92. *Troke*, 1 Q. B. D. 1.

(*c*) *Per Lord Campbell, Id.* (*d*) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 34.

See *Stokes v. Grissell*, 14 C. B. (*e*) *Id.* s. 19.

678; *Jewel v. Stead*, 6 E. & (*f*) *Id.* s. 2 (1).

B. 350; *R. v. Saffron Walden*, (*g*) *Id.* s. 20.

contrary intention appears, the word "parish" means as regards England and Wales a place for which a separate poor rate is or can be made, or a separate overseer appointed (*a*).

An offence made punishable, in the language of our old statutes, by "judgment of life or member," is thereby made a felony (*b*); but when the judgment is "forfeiture of body and goods," or to be at the King's will for body, lands, and goods, the offence is a misdemeanour only (*c*). When a "second offence" is the subject of distinct punishment, it is an offence committed after conviction of a first (*d*). When a case is made triable, or a penalty recoverable in "a Court of Record," the Supreme Court of Judicature alone, but not the Quarter Sessions, is intended (*e*). The punishment of "fine and ransom" is a single pecuniary penalty (*f*), and when to be imposed "at the King's pleasure," this is to be done in his Courts and by his justices (*g*). When imprisonment is provided, immediate imprisonment is generally understood (*h*), and "forfeiture" means forfeiture to the Crown, except when it is imposed for wrongful detention or dispossession; in which cases the forfeiture goes to the benefit of the party wronged (*i*).

(*a*) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 5.

(*f*) 1 Inst. 127a.

(*b*) 1 Hawk. 305.

(*g*) 1 Hale, 375.

(*c*) Co. Litt. 391, 3 Inst. 145.

(*h*) 8 Rep. 119b; comp. 11 &

(*d*) 2 Inst. 468.

12 Vict. c. 43, s. 25.

(*e*) 6 Rep. 19b, 2 Hale, 29;
Jenk. Cent. 228.

(*i*) 1 Inst. 159a, 11 Rep.
60b.

CHAPTER XII.

SECTION I.—IMPLIED ENACTMENTS—NECESSARY INCIDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES.

PASSING from the interpretation of the language of statutes, it remains to consider what intentions are to be attributed to the Legislature, where it has expressed none, on questions necessarily arising out of its enactments.

Although, as already stated, the Legislature is presumed to intend no alteration in the law beyond the immediate and specific purposes of the Act, these are considered as including all the incidents or consequences strictly resulting from the enactment. Thus, when the Legislature imposes upon the promoters of a railway or other undertaking an obligation to construct and maintain works, it necessarily follows that they must bear the cost of construction and maintenance, unless there be an express or plainly implied provision to the contrary (*a*). An Act which declared an offence felony would impliedly give it all the incidents of felony; and it would make it

(*a*) *West India Improvement* [1894] A. C. 243.
Co. v. Atty.-Gen. of Jamaica,

an offence to be an accessory before or after it (a). Where an Act directs that a new offence which it creates shall be tried by an inferior Court according to the course of the common law, the inferior Court tries it as a Common Law Court, subject to all the consequences of common law proceedings, and subject therefore to removal by writs of error, habeas corpus, and certiorari (b). Where the widow of a copyholder became entitled to dower by custom, it was held that she became entitled to all the incidents of dower, such as, among others, to damages, under the Statute of Merton, when deforced of her dower (c). Where trustees were appointed by statute to perform duties which would, of necessity, continue without limit of time, it was held that from the nature of the powers given to them, they were impliedly made a corporation (d). When a local authority had statutory powers to "recover" expenses, it was thereby

(a) 1 Hale, 632, 704; Coal-heavers' Case, 1 Leach, 66; Gray v. R., 11 Cl. & F. 427.

(b) *Per* Lord Mansfield in Hartley v. Hooker, 2 Cowp. 524.

(c) 20 Hen. III.; Shaw v. Thompson, 4 Rep. 30b.

(d) Exp. Newport Trustees, 16 Sim. 346; comp. Williams v. Lords of Admiralty, 11 C. B. 420; Rivers v. Adams, 3 Ex.

D. 361. See also Conservators of River Tone v. Ash, 10 B. & C. 349, and Jeffreys v. Gurr, 2 B. & Ad. 833, where incorporation was implied from the circumstance that there would otherwise be no means of enforcing the rights given by the statute. Comp. Mayor of Salford v. Lancashire C. C., 25 Q. B. D. 384.

also impliedly empowered not only to sue for them, but to sue in its collective designation, although not incorporated (a). The right of shareholders to "inspect" and "peruse" a register of debenture stock, impliedly carries with it the right to take copies. The enactment might otherwise confer a mere illusory right (b). The Bankruptcy Acts, in requiring a bankrupt to answer self-criminating questions relative to his trade and affairs, made his answers subject to the general rules of the law of evidence, and consequently admissible in evidence against him, even in criminal proceedings. To hold otherwise would have been, in effect, to suppose that the Legislature, in expressly changing the law which had hitherto protected him from answering, intended also to make the further change, by mere implication, of suspending, pro tanto, the ordinary rule as regards the admissibility of self-prejudicing statements (c).

The Judgments Extension Act of 1868, which provided for the execution, in Scotland and Ireland, of judgments recovered in England, was considered as having impliedly abolished the rule of procedure which required that a plaintiff residing out of the jurisdiction should give security for costs ; the logical reason for the rule (which was, that if the verdict were against

(a) *Mills v. Scott*, L. R. 8 lands Ry., 38 Ch. D. 92.
Q. B. 496. (c) *R. v. Scott*, D. & B. 47;
(b) 26 & 27 Vict. c. 118, s. *Re Sankey*, 25 Q. B. D. 17.
28; *Mutter v. Eastern & Mid-*

the plaintiff, he would not be within the reach of the process of the Court for costs) having been swept away by the enactment (*a*).

So, the owner or master of a ship is tacitly relieved from liability for the injuries done by the ship through the acts or neglect of a pilot, where the employment of the latter is compulsory by law; the pilot performing a duty imposed by statute, and being neither appointed by nor under the control of the owner or master (*b*).

An Act which simply creates a corporation, impliedly gives it the legal attributes of one, among which is a general power to make contracts (*c*); but no such attributes are implied when the body is created a corporation for certain purposes only, as in the case with railway companies and companies incorporated under the Limited Liability Acts of 1862 and 1867, which are restricted to the purposes set forth in the memorandum of association. Their power of contracting is similarly restricted (*d*); and a contract

(*a*) *Raeburn v. Andrews*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 118.

(*b*) *Carruthers v. Sydebotham*, 4 M. & S. 77; *The Maria*, 1 W. Rob. 95; *The Agricola*, 2 W. Rob. 10; *Lucey v. Ingram*, 6 M. & W. 302; *The Clan Gordon*, 7 P. D. 190; comp. *The China*, 7 Wallace, 67.

(*c*) See *Ashbury, etc. Co.*

v. Riche, L. R. 7 H. L. 653.

Broughton v. Manchester Waterworks, 3 B. & A. 12; *Shears v. Jacob*, L. R. 1 C. P. 53, and the cases collected in *S. of Ireland Colliery v. Wardle*, L. R. 3 C. P. 463, 4 Id. 617.

(*d*) *Id.*; and see *East Anglian R. Co. v. Eastern Counties R. Co.*, 11 C. B. 775; *South York-*

entered into beyond its competency could not be ratified even by the unanimous assent of the shareholders, for this would be an attempt to do what the Act of Parliament prohibits (*a*).

Where an Act provided that the costs and expenses incident to passing it, should be paid by the Metropolitan Board, but did not state to whom they should be paid, it was held that they were payable to the promoters only, and not to agents and other persons employed by them (*b*).

A private Act which, after annexing a rectory to the deanery of Windsor, recited that the dean's residence at the latter place would oblige his frequent absence from the rectory, and required him to appoint a curate to reside there, was deemed to give him, by implication, an exemption from residence (*c*).

But this extension of an enactment is confined to its strictly necessary incidents or logical consequences. When, for instance, a statute requires the performance of a service, it implies no provision that the person performing it shall be remunerated (*d*). An Act which empowered justices to discharge an apprentice from

shire R. Co. *v.* Great N. R. Co., Taunt. 48.

9 Ex. 55.

(*a*) *Per* Lord Cairns, L. R. 7
H. L. 672.

(*b*) *Wyatt v. Metrop. B. of*
Works, 11 C. B. N. S. 744.

(*c*) *Wright v. Legge*, 6

(*d*) *Per* Lord Abinger in

Jones v. Carmarthen, 8 M. & W.
605; *R. v. Hull*, 2 E. & B.

182; *R. v. Allday*, 7 Id. 799.

See also *Alresford v. Scott*, 7

Q. B. D. 210.

his apprenticeship, if ill-treated by his master, would not inferentially empower them to order a return of the premium ; for however just it might be that such a return should be made, and convenient that it should be ordered by the tribunal which cancelled the indenture, such a power was not the logical or necessary incident or result of that which was expressly conferred (a). Although the 33 & 34 Vict. c. 93 absolved a husband from liability for the antenuptial debts of his wife, and made the latter capable of being a trader, and "liable to be sued for," and her separate property subject to satisfy, her debts, "as if she had continued unmarried;" a married woman having separate property, was not, as a logical consequence of such liabilities, liable to be made a bankrupt (b). Money received by the treasurer of a trading club on account of the club is none the less the property of the members as beneficial owners, because the club was formed in contravention of s. 4 of the Companies Act, 1862, and has consequently no legal existence as a company, association, or co-partnership (c). Where a gas company is required by

(a) *R. v. Vandeleer*, 1 Stra. 20 Q. B. D. 249; *Re Goldring*, 22 Q. B. D. 87; *Scott* 69; *East v. Pell*, 4 M. & W. 665.

(b) *Exp. Holland*, L. R. 9 v. *Morley*, 20 Q. B. D. 120; *R. v. Brittleton*, 12 Q. B. D. 266; *Stanton v. Lambert*, 39 Ch. D. 484. But now she is liable, 45 & 46 Vict. c. 75, s. 1, sub-s. 626.

5. See also *Exp. Blanchett*, 17 (c) 25 & 26 Vict. c. 89; *R. v. Tankard*, [1894] 1 Q. B. 548.

statute to supply gas to the public lamps in a town from sunrise to sunset at a fixed annual sum per lamp, the burners to consume not less than a certain amount of gas per hour, there is no implied provision that on failure of the supply on certain days it is only to be entitled to a smaller sum (*a*). The Tithe Commutation Act, 1836, which authorised a tenant who paid the tithe rent-charge to deduct the amount from the rent next due, gave no implied right to sue the landlord for the payment, the landlord not being liable to pay the tithe (*b*). And s. 13 of the Stannaries Act, 1869, which gives power to a cost book mining company to bring an action against a shareholder, for unpaid calls, in the name of their purser, does not consequently authorise the purser to present a bankruptcy petition in his own name on behalf of the company against a shareholder in respect of a judgment recovered by him in such action (*c*).

Where a statute requires a thing to be done, but does not impose a specific fine for not doing it, it is not for the Court inferentially to draw the conclusion that a penalty is incurred (*d*).

- (*a*) *Richmond Gas Co. v. & B.* 37.
Richmond Corporation, [1893] 1 Q. B. 56. (*c*) *Re Nance*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 590. See *Guthrie v. Fisk*, 3 B. & C. 178; *Sunderland Bd. v. Frankland*, L. R. 8 Q. B. 18.
(*b*) 6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 71, s. 80; *Dawes v. Thomas*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 414. As to land tax see *Andrew v. Handcock*, 1 Brod. (*d*) *Hammond v. Pulsford*, [1895] 1 Q. B. 223.

SECTION II.—IMPLIED POWERS AND OBLIGATIONS.

Where an Act confers a jurisdiction, it impliedly grants, also, the power of doing all such acts, or employing such means, as are essentially necessary to its execution. *Cui jurisdictio data est, ea quoque concessa esse videntur, sine quibus jurisdictio explicari non potuit (a)*. Thus, an Act which empowers justices to require persons to take an oath as special constables, or gives them jurisdiction to inquire into an offence, impliedly empowers them to apprehend the persons who unlawfully fail to attend before them for those purposes; otherwise the jurisdiction could not be effectually exercised (*b*). So, where an inferior Court is empowered to grant an injunction, the power of punishing disobedience to it by commitment is impliedly conveyed by the enactment; for the power would be useless if it could not be enforced (*c*). And it is laid down that where a statute empowers a justice to bind a person over, or to cause him to do something, and the person, in his presence, refuses, the justice has impliedly authority to commit him to jail till he complies (*d*). An Act which authorises the

(a) Dig. 2, 1, 2.

(b) Oath before justices, 12 Rep. 131; 2 Hawk. c. 13, s. 15; *Bane v. Methuen*, 2 Bing. 63. *Comp. R. v. Twyford*, 5 A. & E. 430. See also *Hawe v. Plan-*

ner, 1 Saund. 10; *Burton v. Henson*, 10 M. & W. 105.

(c) *Exp. Martin*, 4 Q. B. D. 212, 491.

(d) 2 Hawk. c. 16, s. 2.

making of bye-laws impliedly authorises the annexation of a reasonable pecuniary penalty for their infringement, recoverable (in the absence of other provision) by action or distress (*a*).

The enactment that at the election of poor law guardians the votes should be taken and returned as the commissioners should direct, impliedly authorised the appointment of a returning officer (*b*). An Act which, after empowering the parishioners to elect an assistant overseer, provided that this power should cease where an assistant overseer had been appointed by the Poor Law Commissioners (who had previously no power to make such an appointment), and while their order of appointment remained in force, would seem to have given the Commissioners that power by implication (*c*). Where a judgment was recovered in a county court against its bailiff, a power to appoint a special bailiff to levy execution in that case was held to be necessarily incident to the Court (*d*).

So it was held that when a duty was imposed on a county, and costs necessarily arose in questioning the propriety of an act done to enforce that duty—as, for instance, in disputing the liability of a fine imposed on the county for neglect to repair the county jail—

(*a*) 5 Rep. 631; 2 Kyd, 40; *R. v. Oldham*, 10 Q. B. 700. Corp. 156; *Hall v. Nixon*, L. R. (c) *R. v. Greene*, 17 Q. B. 10 Q. B. 152; *R. v. Sankey*, 3 793. See *Cullen v. Trimble*, Q. B. D. 379. See 52 & 53 L. R. 7 Q. B. 416, sup., p. 185. Vict. c. 63, s. 32. (*d*) *Bellamy v. Hoyle*, L. R.

(*b*) 4 & 5 Will. IV. c. 76, s. 10 Ex. 220.

the justices, who had the superintendence of the county purse, had impliedly a right to defray such costs out of it (a).

In the same way, when powers, privileges, or property are granted by statute, everything indispensable to their exercise or enjoyment is impliedly granted also, as it would be in a grant between private persons. Thus, as by a private grant or reservation of trees, the power of entering on the land where they stand, and of cutting them down and carrying them away, is impliedly given or reserved; and by the grant of mines, the power to dig them (b); so under a Parliamentary authority to build a bridge on a stranger's land, the grantee tacitly acquires the right of erecting, on the land, the temporary scaffolding which is essential to the execution of the work (c). Where an express statutory right is given to make and maintain something requiring support, the statute, in the absence of a controlling context, must be taken to mean that the right of support shall accompany the right to make and maintain. If the Act does not provide any means of obtaining compensation for

- (a) *R. v. Essex*, 4 T. R. 591, [1891] 3 Ch. 432.
per Lord Kenyon; *R. v. White*, 14 Q. B. D. 358. See *Atty.-Gen. v. Brecon*, 10 Ch. D. 204. And see as to the implied right of a trading company to borrow, *General Auction Co. v. Smith*,
 (b) *Shep. Touchst.* 89; *Roll. Ab. Incidents*, A.
 (c) *The Clarence R. Co. v. The G. N. of England R. Co.*, 13 M. & W. 706.

the loss occasioned to the landowner by his having to leave support, this is a strong argument against the Legislature having intended to give such right; but if it contains provisions under which compensation can be obtained, it needs a strong context to show that the right of support is not given (*a*).

So, if the Legislature authorises the construction of a work or the use of a particular thing for a particular purpose, the permission carries with it impliedly an exemption from responsibility for any damage arising from the use, without negligence (i.e., the neglect of some care which one is bound by law to exercise towards somebody (*b*)); as, for instance, when haystacks are fired by locomotive engines plying on railways (*c*). So trustees and official persons who are authorised to execute a work, such as to raise a

(*a*) *L. & N. W. R. Co. v. Evans*, [1893] 1 Ch. 16. Comp. *Ruabon Co. v. G. W. R.*, [1892] 1 Ch. 427; *Bell v. Earl of Dudley*, [1895] 1 Ch. 182.

(*b*) *Per Bowen L.J.* in *Thomas v. Quartermaine*, 18 Q. B. D. at p. 694.

(*c*) *R. v. Pease*, 4 B. & Ad. 30; *Vaughan v. Taff Valley R. Co.*, 5 H. & N. 679, (questioned by *Bramwell L.J.* in *Powell v. Fall*, 5 Q. B. D. 601); *Fremantle v. London & N. W. R. Co.*, 10 C. B. N. S. 89; *Blyth v.*

Birmingham Waterworks Co., 11 Ex. 781; *Dunn v. Birmingham Canal Co.*, L. R. 8 Q. B. 42; *Hammersmith R. Co. v. Brand*, L. R. 4 H. L. 171; *Atty.-Gen. v. Metrop. R. Co.*, [1894] 1 Q. B. 384; *Cracknell v. Thetford*, L. R. 4 C. P. 629; *Geddis v. Bann Com.*, 3 App. Cas. 430, *per Lord Blackburn*; *National Telephone Co. v. Baker*, [1893] 2 Ch. 186; *Stretton's Derby Brewery Co. v. Mayor of Derby*, [1894] 1 Ch. 431.

road, to lower a hill, or to make a drain, are impliedly authorised, if necessary for the due execution of their task, to prejudice the rights, or injure the property of third persons (a). Where Commissioners have to construct works, and may levy rates to pay for their construction, there is an implication, unless it be clearly negated by something in the Act to the contrary, that it is within their power to levy a rate to provide for a liability incurred through the work being done negligently by their servants (b). And a statute which authorises a Local Board to employ a proper number of persons to act as firemen, impliedly authorises such firemen to preserve order during a fire, and to exclude such persons from the burning premises as it may be necessary to exclude, so as to prevent the inconvenience which would arise from overcrowding or interference with their work (c).

But when an Act confers such powers, it also impliedly requires that they shall be exercised only for the purposes for which they were given, and subject to the conditions which it prescribes, and also with due skill and diligence, and in a way to prevent a needless mischief or injury (d). A power, for in-

(a) *Per Williams J.*, in *Whitehouse v. Fellowes*, 10 C. B. N. S. 780; *Sutton v. Clarke*, 6 Taunt. 29; *Stainton v. Woolrych*, 23 Beav. 225.

(b) *Galloworthy v. Selby Commissioners*, [1892] 1 Q. B. 348;

Gibbs v. Mersey Docks, L. R. 1 H. L. 93; *Southampton Bridge Co. v. Southampton Local Board*, 8 E. & B. 801.

(c) *Carter v. Thomas*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 673.

(d) *Jones v. Bird*, 5 B. & Ald.

stance, to establish asylums for the sick would not authorise the establishment of a small-pox hospital in such a place or circumstances as to be a common nuisance (a).

And further, as a grant of fish in a pond does not carry with it an authority to dig a trench to let the water out to take the fish, since they can be taken by nets or other devices, without doing such damage (b); so, a statute does not give by implication any powers not absolutely essential to the privilege or property granted. An authority to construct a sewer on the land of another, for instance, would not carry with it the right to lateral support from the land, if it was possible to construct an adequate sewer independent of such support (c). An Act of Parliament does not, by authorising persons to repair and cleanse a navigable river, impliedly authorise them to dig, in the bed of the river, the soil of which is vested in the owner of a several fishery, a canal or passage to a new

837 ; *Grocers' Co. v. Donne*, 3 Bing. N.C. 34 ; *Clothier v. Webster*, 12 C. B. N. S. 790 ; *Trower v. Chadwick*, 3 Bing. N. C. 334 ; *Lawrence v. G. N. R. Co.*, 16 Q. B. 643 ; *Collins v. Middle Level Commrs.*, L. R. 4 C. P. 279 ; *Geddis v. Bann Com.*, 3 App. Cas. 430. *Rapier v. London Tramways Co.*, [1893] 2 Ch. 588 ; *Vernon v. St. James's Vestry*, 16 Ch. D. 449. And comp. *L. B. & S. C. R. v. Truman*, 11 App. Cas. 45.

(b) *Finch's Disc. on Law*, 63 ; *Gearns v. Baker*, L. R. 10 Ch. 355. (c) *Metrop. Board v. Metrop. Railway Co.*, L. R. 4 C. P. 192. *Metrop. Asylum District v. Hill*, See *Roderick v. Aston Local Board*, 5 Ch. D. 328. 6 App. Cas. 193. See also

wharf, for the convenience of their barges, to the prejudice of the fishery (*a*). Authority given to make a railway for the passage of waggons, engines and other carriages, does not impliedly give power to use locomotives on it; as other means of traction may be employed. Therefore, if injury arises from the use of a locomotive, under such circumstances, the general rule of law implies, that a person who uses a dangerous thing is liable to an action for any injury which he does by it (*b*). Ordinary railway, gas, and mining companies, on this principle, have no implied power to draw, accept, or indorse bills or notes; for this is not essential to their business (*c*). So, it has been held that a Colonial legislative body has, impliedly granted to it by the Act or charter which constitutes it, the power of removing and keeping excluded from the chamber where it carries on its deliberations, all persons who interrupt its proceedings; for such a power is absolutely indispensable for the proper exercise of its functions. But a power of punishing such offenders for their contempt of its authority is not necessary for this purpose, and so is not granted by implication (*d*).

(*a*) *Partheriche v. Mason*, 2 Mary Abbott's, 15 Q. B. D. 1.
Chit. 658. See *Fletcher v. Rylands*, L. R.

(*b*) *Jones v. Festiniog R. Co.*, 3 H. L. 330.

L. R. 3 Q. B. 733; *R. v. Bradford Navigation*, 6 B. & S. 631; (*c*) *Bateman v. Mid Wales R. Co.*, L. R. 1 C. P. 499, and *Powell v. Fall*, 5 Q. B. D. 597; the cases collected there.

Gas Light and Coke Co. v. St. (*d*) *Keilly v. Carson*, 4 Moo. P.

If land is vested by Act of Parliament in persons for public purposes, a power of conveying away any part of it would not be impliedly granted (*a*). So, where a statute prohibited bathing on the shore except from bathing machines, which the local authorities were empowered to license, that power did not entitle a licensed person to place a bathing machine on the shore without the consent of the owner of the shore (*b*).

The concession of privileges or powers carries with it, often, implied obligations. For instance, an Act which gives a power to dig up the soil of streets for a particular purpose, such as making a drain, impliedly casts on those thus empowered the duty of filling up the ground again, and of restoring the street to its original condition (*c*). If it imposed a liability on one person to keep in repair a work in the possession of another, it would be understood as impliedly imposing on the latter the obligation of giving notice of the needed repair to the party liable (*d*).

C. 163 ; *Fenton v. Hampton*, 11 (b) *Mace v. Philcox*, 15 C. B. Id. 347 ; *Re Brown*, 5 B. & S. N. S. 600.

280 ; *Doyle v. Falconer*, L. R. (c) *Gray v. Pullen*, 5 B. & S. 1 P. C. 328. See *Spilsbury v.* 970.

Micklethwaite, 1 Taunt. 146. (d) *London & S. W. R. Co. v.*

(a) *Wadmore v. Dear*, L. R. *Flower*, 1 C. P. D. 77 ; *Makin* 7 C. P. 212 ; *Tepper v. Nichols*, *v. Watkinson*, L. R. 6 Ex. 25. See *Scaltock v. Harston*, 1 C. 18 C. B. N. S. 121 ; *Mulliner* P. D. 106 ; *Brown v. G. E. R.* *v. Midland Ry. Co.*, 11 Ch. D. Co., 2 Q. B. D. 406. 611.

A public body, authorised to make a bridge or tow-path and to take tolls for its use, is impliedly bound to keep it in proper repair, as long as it takes the tolls and invites the public to use the work; or at least, to give those whom they invite to use it, due warning of the defect which makes it unfit for use (*a*).

If statutory authority is given to persons, primarily for their own benefit and profit, rather than for any advantage which the public may incidentally derive, such as to cut through a highway and throw a bridge over the cutting, or to substitute a new road for the old one; the burden of maintaining the new work in repair would impliedly be cast on them, and not on the county or parish (*b*). Another duty which would also be impliedly imposed on them by such an enactment would be that of protecting the public from any danger attending the use of the new work. If it was a swing bridge, for instance, they would be bound to take due precautions to prevent persons from attempting to cross it, while it was open (*c*). If the work was a railway, crossing a highway on a level,

(*a*) *Winch v. Conservators of the Thames*, L. R. 9 C. P. 378; *Nicholl v. Allen*, 1 B. & S. 934; *Forbes v. Lee Cons. Board*, 4 Ex. D. 116. *v. Ely*, 15 Q. B. 827; *North Staffordshire R. Co. v. Dale*, 8 E. & B. 836; *Leech v. North Staffordshire R. Co.*, 29 L. J. M. C 151; *Lancashire & Yorkshire R.*

(*b*) *R. v. Kent*, 13 East, 220; *R. v. Lindsay*, 14 East, 317; *R. v. Kerrison*, 3 M. & S. 526; *R. Co. v. Bury*, 14 App. Cas. 417. (*c*) *Manley v. St. Helen's Co.*, 2 H. & N. 840.

they would be impliedly bound to keep the crossing in a proper state to admit of the use of the highway by carriages, without damage to them (*a*).

And this implied obligation would not be excluded on the principle *expressum facit cessare tacitum*, by the fact that certain duties are expressly imposed by statute on railway companies who make such crossings; ex. gr., to erect and maintain gates where the public road crosses the railway, and to employ men to open and shut them, and to keep them closed except when carriages have to cross (*b*). So, notwithstanding all such express provisions, the company would be bound, by implication, to prevent all passage along the portion of the highway thus intersected, when it was dangerous to cross (*c*).

But power to pull down the wall of a house without causing unnecessary inconvenience would not impliedly involve the obligation of putting up a hoarding for the protection of the rooms exposed by the demolition (*d*).

Sometimes the express imposition of one duty impliedly imposes another. Thus, when it was enacted that no license should be refused except on one or more of four specified grounds, the obligation was imposed by implication on the justices, of stating

(*a*) *Oliver v. N. E. R. Co.*,
L. R. 9 Q. B. 409.

(*b*) *Id.*; *Wanless v. N. E. R.*
Co., L. R. 7 H. L. 12.

(*c*) *Lunt v. London & N. W.*
R. Co., L. R. 1 Q. B. 277.

(*d*) *Thompson v. Hill*, L. R. 5
C. P. 564.

on which of the specified grounds they based their refusal (a). The Ballot Act of 1872, which imposes, in express terms, certain specific duties on the presiding officers at polling stations, casts also on those officers, by implication, the duty of being present at their stations during an election, and of providing the voters with voting papers bearing the official mark required by the Act (b).

A duty or right imposed or given to one, may also cast by implication a corresponding burthen on another, as in the case of the proviso in the Commission of the Peace, requiring the Quarter Sessions not to give judgment in cases of difficulty unless in the presence of one of the Judges of Assize; which impliedly requires the judge to give his opinion (c). So, the Charitable Trusts Act, 1855, which enacts that it shall not be lawful for the trustees of a charity to make any grant otherwise than (among other things) with the approval of the Charity Commissioners, was considered as requiring the Commissioners to give their approval in a case where the grant was made before the Act was passed (d).

The grant of a privilege or of property to one, may sometimes impliedly give a right to another person.

(a) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 27, s. 8; (c) *Per Cur.* in *R. v. Chan-*
R. v. Sykes, 1 Q. B. D. 52; *Exp.* *trell*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 587.

Smith, 3 Q. B. D. 374. (d) *Moore v. Clench*, 1 Ch. D.

(b) *Pickering v. James*, L. R. 447.
8 C. P. 489.

Thus, an Act which empowered a hospital to take and hold lands by will, gift, or purchase, without incurring the penalties of the Mortmain Acts, was held to empower persons to devise or convey lands to it; it being considered that the Act would otherwise be nugatory (*a*). But power given to a corporation to take lands only avoids the necessity of obtaining a license to hold in mortmain, and does not affect the disability of the grantor (*b*). And an Act which gave one railway company power to purchase certain lands and to construct a railway, according to the deposited plans and books of reference, would not give by implication to another company the correlative power to sell any of those lands to it (*c*).

Again, in giving judicial powers to affect prejudicially the rights of person or property, a statute is understood as silently implying, when it does not expressly provide, the condition or qualification that the power is to be exercised in accordance with the fundamental rules of judicial procedure, such, for instance, as that which requires that, before its exercise, the person sought to be prejudicially affected shall have an opportunity of defending himself (*d*).

On this ground, under the 4 & 5 Will. IV. c. 76,

- | | |
|---|--|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Perring v. Trail</i> , 18 Eq. | <i>Southey</i> , 36 Ch. D. 9. |
| 88; comp. <i>Nethersole v. Indig.</i> | (<i>c</i>) <i>R. v. S. Wales R. Co.</i> , 14 |
| <i>Blind</i> , L. R. 11 Eq. 1. | Q. B. 902. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Moggs v. Hodges</i> , 2 Ves. | (<i>d</i>) <i>Bagg's Case</i> , 11 Rep. 99; |
| sen. 52, cited in <i>Webster v.</i> | <i>R. v. Univ. of Cambridge</i> , Stra. |

which authorises justices "at their just and proper "discretion" to order out-door relief to an aged or infirm pauper who is unable to work, no such order could be made without summoning those on whom the order was to be made (a). So, where an Act authorised justices, where it appeared that the appointment of special constables had been occasioned by the behaviour of persons employed by railway or other companies, in executing public works, to make an order on the treasurer of the company to pay the special constables for their services, which order, if allowed by a Secretary of State, should be binding on the company; it was held that no such order could be validly made without giving the company notice, and an opportunity of being heard against it (b). So, where a Colonial enactment authorised the Governor to declare a lease forfeited, if it was proved to the satisfaction of a Commissioner that the lessee had failed to reside on the demised land, the Commissioner could not lawfully be satisfied without summoning the lessee and holding a judicial inquiry (c).

557; *Emerson v. Newfoundland*, 8 Moo. P. C. 157; *Exp. Ramshay*, 21 L. J. Q. B. 238; *Thorburn v. Barnes*, L. R. 2 C. P. 384; *Re Pollard*, L. R. 2 P. C. 106; *R. v. Jenkins*, 3 B. & S. 116. "Neque Scythæ neque Sarmatæ ita unquam judicarunt, judicium ab unâ parte ferentes,

absenti eo qui accusatur neque recusanti judicium."—Chrysostom, *Epist. ad Innocentem*.

(a) *R. v. Totnes Union*, 7 Q. B. 690.

(b) 1 & 2 Vict. c. 80; *R. v. Cheshire Lines Committee*, L. R. 8 Q. B. 344.

(c) *Smith v. R.*, 3 App. Cas. 614.

The Metropolitan Local Management Act, which requires that before the foundations of a building are laid, a seven days' notice shall be given to the district board, and authorises that board to order the demolition of any building erected without such notice, was construed as impliedly imposing on the board the condition of either giving the presumed defaulter a hearing before making the order, or notice that the order had been made, so that he might remonstrate, or appeal, before proceeding to the demolition of his building; and a district board, which had confined itself to the letter of the Act, and had demolished a building respecting which it had received no notice, without first calling on the owner to show cause against its order for doing so, was held liable in an action, as a wrong-doer (*a*). A statute which required justices to issue a distress warrant to enforce a rate or other charge, even though it directed them to issue it "on proof of demand and non-payment," would nevertheless be construed as impliedly requiring that they should not do so, without first summoning the party against whom it was demanded, and giving him a hearing against the step proposed to be taken against him (*b*).

(*a*) 18 & 19 Vict. c. 120; *Atty.-Gen. v. Hooper*, [1893] 3 Cooper v. Wandsworth Board, Ch. 484.

14 C. B. N. S. 180; *Clerkenwell Vestry v. Feary*, 24 Q. B. D. 703; *Hopkins v. Smethwick Local Board*, 24 Q. B. D. 712; (*b*) See *Harper v. Carr*, 7 T. R. 270; *R. v. Hughes*, 3 A. & E. 425; *Painter v. Liverpool Gas Co.*, Id. 433.

An Act which empowered a bishop, when it appeared to his satisfaction, either from his own knowledge or from proof laid before him, that the duties of a benefice were inadequately performed, to require the incumbent to appoint and pay a curate; and if he failed to comply within three months, himself to make the appointment and to fix the stipend; was considered as importing the same condition of giving a hearing before exercising the power; and therefore as not authorising the bishop, even when acting on his own personal knowledge, to issue the requisition (which was in the nature of a judgment) without having given the holder of the benefice an opportunity of being heard (*a*).

A power to remove a person from his office or employment for lawful cause only, would, on the same principle, involve the condition that it was to be exercisable only after a due hearing, or the opportunity of being heard, had been given to the person proposed to be removed (*b*). But it would, of course, be different if the person was removable arbitrarily and without any cause being assigned (*c*).

It is obvious that where an Act which creates a

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) <i>Capel v. Child</i>, 2 Cr. & J. 558; questioned by Alderson B. in <i>Re Hammersmith Rent Charge</i>, 4 Ex. 87. See <i>Bonaker v. Evans</i>, 16 Q. B. 162; <i>Bartlett v. Kirkwood</i>, 2 E. & B. 771. <i>Comp. Marquis of Abergavenny</i></p> | <p><i>v. Bp. of Llandaff</i>, 20 Q. B. D. 460. (<i>b</i>) <i>R. v. Smith</i>, 5 Q. B. 614. (<i>c</i>) <i>Exp. Teather</i>, 1 L. M. & P. 7; <i>R. v. Darlington School</i>, 6 Q. B. 682; <i>Exp. Sandys</i>, 4 B. & Ad. 863.</p> |
|---|---|

new jurisdiction, gives any person dissatisfied with its decision an appeal to another judicial authority, which is empowered to confirm or annul the decision, as to it shall appear just and proper, the right of being heard in support of his appeal is impliedly given to the appellant (*a*).

Under the provision of the first County Court Act (8 & 9 Vict. c. 95), which empowered the judge to summon a judgment debtor, and, if satisfied that he had the means of paying his debt, to order him to pay it either in one sum or by instalments, and if he failed to obey, to commit him to jail; it was held that an order to pay by future instalments, and in default of paying any of them to be committed, was invalid; for it made the debtor liable to imprisonment for not making a payment at a future time, without then having an opportunity of defending himself. As the language of the Act was not inconsistent with the general principle that a person ought not to be punished without having had an opportunity of being heard, it was construed as tacitly embodying it. The judge could not properly exercise any discretion until the time of commitment (*b*).

(*a*) *R. v. Archbishop of Canterbury*, 1 E. & E. 545. See other instances, *Re Phillips' Charity*, 9 Jur. 959; *Re Fre-mington School*, 10 Jur. 512; *Davenport v. R.*, L. R. 3 App. Cas. 115.

(*b*) See *Kinning's Case*, 10 Q. B. 730; *Kinning v. Buchanan*, 8 C. B. 271; *Abley v. Dale*, 10 C. B. 62. See also *Hesketh v. Atherton*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 4; *Lovering v. Dawson*, L. R. 10 C. P. 711. Comp. R.

It would be different where the statute gave a power of immediate commitment in default of immediate payment (*a*). And again, if the opportunity of defence was provided at another stage, there would be no adequate ground for thus implying the condition in question. For instance, when a statute provided that if a rent-charge was in arrear, it might be levied by distress, and that if it remained in arrear for forty days, and there was no distress, a judge, upon an affidavit of these facts, might order the sheriff to summon a jury to assess the arrears unpaid; it was held that such an order might well be made *ex parte*. The party subject to prejudice had his opportunity of defence before the sheriff (*b*). So, where an Act authorised justices to inquire and adjudge the settlement of a pauper lunatic, and to make an order on his parish to pay for his maintenance, and empowered the parish to appeal against any such order; it was held that the order might be made without giving the parish sought to be affected notice of the intended inquiries (*c*). And an application to the Court by a trustee in bankruptcy for leave to prosecute a bankrupt for an offence under the Debtors Act, 1869, was properly made *ex parte* and without notice to the bankrupt (*d*).

v. Brompton C. C. Judge, 18 Q. Charge, 4 Ex. 87.

B. D. 215.

(*c*) Exp. Monkleigh, 5 D. &

(*a*) *Arnold v. Dimsdale*, 2 E. L. 404.

& B. 580.

(*d*) Exp. Marsden, 2 Ch. D.

(*b*) *Re Hammersmith Rent* 786.

An Act which empowers two or more justices, or other persons (*a*), to do any act of a judicial, as distinguished from a ministerial nature, impliedly requires that they should all be personally present and acting together in its performance, whether to hear the evidence, or to view when they are to act on personal inspection (*b*); to consult together, and form their judgment (*c*); and in the case of justices authorised to try offences summarily, to abstain from exercising their jurisdiction when it appears that a *bonâ fide* claim of right or title is set up (*d*). When the act to be performed is ministerial, it is not necessary, on general principles, that the persons authorised to do it should meet together for the purpose; and the statute which gave such authority would therefore not be construed as impliedly requiring it (*e*).

When a new jurisdiction is given to an existing Court to deal with new matter in a different mode

(*a*) So, directors of companies, *East*, 244; *Battye v. Gresley*, 8 D'Arcy *v. Tamar R. Co.*, L. R. 2 Id. 319; *Grindley v. Barker*, Ex. 158; *Cook v. Ward*, 2 C. P. 1 B. & P. 229; *Cook v. Loveland*, 2 Id. 31; *R. v. Mills*, 2 D. 255.

(*b*) *R. v. Cambridgeshire*, 4 B. & Ad. 578; *R. v. Totness*, A. & E. 111. 11 Q. B. 80; *R. v. Aldbrough*, 13 Q. B. 190.

(*c*) *Billings v. Prinn*, 2 W. Bl. 1017; *R. v. Hamstall Redware*, 3 T. R. 380; *R. v. Forrest*, Id. 38; *R. v. Stotfold*, 4 T. R. 596; *R. v. Winwick*, 8 T. R. 454; *R. v. Great Marlow*, 2

(*d*) *Per Blackburn J. in White v. Feast*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 353.

(*e*) *Re Hopper*, L. R. 2 Q. B. 367.

and a different procedure, it is understood, unless the contrary be expressed or plainly implied, to be intended to be exercised according to the general inherent powers of the Court (*a*).

It has been already mentioned that when a power is conferred to do some act of a judicial nature, or of public concern and interest, there is implied an obligation to exercise it, when the occasion for it arises (*b*). This implied obligation is usually said to modify the language creating the power, when permissive, by making it imperative; but it seems to be a matter of implied enactment, rather than of verbal interpretation.

SECTION III.—IMPERATIVE OR DIRECTORY.

When a statute requires that something shall be done, or done in a particular manner or form, without expressly declaring what shall be the consequence of non-compliance, the question often arises, what intention is to be attributed by inference to the Legislature? Where, indeed, the whole aim and object of the Legislature would be plainly defeated if the command to do the thing in a particular manner did not imply a prohibition to do it in any other, no doubt can be entertained as to the intention. The enactment, for instance, of the Metropolitan

(*a*) Dale's Case, 6 Q. B. D. 450. (*b*) Sup., pp. 334-351.

Building Act (*a*), that the walls of buildings shall be constructed of brick, stone, or other incombustible material, though containing no prohibitory words, obviously prohibits by implication and makes illegal their construction with any other (*b*). So, the directions in the rubrics of the prayer-book for the performance of the rites and ceremonies of the Church, are equally imperative in prohibiting all omissions and additions (*c*). Again, where compliance is made, in terms, a condition precedent, to the validity or legality of what is done; as when, for example, the deed of a married woman was to take effect “when” the certificate of her acknowledgment of it was filed (*d*); or where it was provided that no appeal should be entertained “unless” certain rules were complied with (*e*); the neglect of the statutory requisites would obviously be fatal.

But the reports are full of cases without any such indications of intention; in some of which the conditions, forms, or other attendant circumstances prescribed by the statute have been regarded as essential to the act or thing regulated by it, and their omission has been held fatal to its validity; while in others, such prescriptions have been considered as merely

- | | |
|--|--|
| (<i>a</i>) 18 & 19 Vict. c. 122, s. 12. | (<i>d</i>) 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 74, s. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Stevens v. Gourley</i> , 7 C. | 86; <i>Jolly v. Hancock</i> , 7 Ex. |
| B. N. S. 99. | 820. |
| (<i>c</i>) <i>Westerton v. Liddell</i> , re- | (<i>e</i>) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71; |
| ported by <i>Moore</i> , p. 187; <i>Martin</i> | <i>Re Dickinson</i> , 51 L. J. Ch. D. |
| <i>v. Maconochie</i> , L. R. 2 P. C. 365. | 736. |

directory, the neglect of which did not affect its validity, or involve any other consequence than a liability to a penalty, if any were imposed, for breach of the enactment. The propriety, indeed, of ever treating the provisions of any statute in the latter manner has been sometimes questioned (*a*); but it is justifiable in principle as well as abundantly established by numerous authorities.

It has been said that no rule can be laid down for determining whether the command is to be considered as a mere direction or instruction involving no invalidating consequence in its disregard, or as imperative, with an implied nullification for disobedience, beyond the fundamental one that it depends on the scope and object of the enactment (*b*). It may, perhaps, be found generally correct to say that nullification is the natural and usual consequence of disobedience; but the question is in the main governed by considerations of convenience and justice (*c*), and when that result would involve general inconvenience or injustice to innocent persons, or advantage to those guilty of the neglect, without promoting the real aim and object of the enactment, such an intention is not to be attributed to the Legislature.

(*a*) *Per* Martin B. in *Bowman v. Blyth*, 7 E. & B. 47; Sedgwick on Interp. of Stats. 375. *Turner*, 2 De G. F. & J. 502; *per* Lord Penzance in *Howard v. Bodington*, 2 P. D. 211.

(*b*) *Per* Lord Campbell in *Liverpool Borough Bank v. Ingall*, 2 Q. B. D. 208. (*c*) See *per* Lush J. in *R. v.*

In the first place, a strong line of distinction may be drawn between cases where the prescriptions of the Act affect the performance of a duty, and where they relate to a privilege or power (*a*). Where powers or rights are granted, with a direction that certain regulations or formalities shall be complied with, it seems neither unjust nor inconvenient to exact a rigorous observance of them as essential to the acquisition of the right or authority conferred; and it is therefore probable that such was the intention of the Legislature. But when a public duty is imposed, and the statute requires that it shall be performed in a certain manner, or within a certain time, or under other specified conditions, such prescriptions may well be regarded as intended to be directory only, when injustice or inconvenience to others who have no control over those exercising the duty would result, if such requirements were essential and imperative.

Taking the former class of cases, it seems that when a statute confers a right, privilege, or immunity, the regulations, forms, or conditions which it prescribes for its acquisition are imperative, in the sense that non-observance of any of them is fatal. Thus, where an Act gave to the designers of prints the sole right of printing them for fourteen years after the day of publication, adding, "which (day) shall be truly engraved, with the name of the proprietor, on each

(*a*) See *per* Denman J. in *Caldow v. Pixell*, 2 C. P. D. 562.

“plate;” it was held that the neglect to comply with this provision was fatal to the copyright (*a*). So, under the enactment that no proprietor of a copyright should be entitled to sue for its infringement, unless he had made an entry at Stationers’ Hall of the title and time of the first publication of the book, and the name and abode of the publisher, it was held that a suit was not maintainable, where the day of publication was not stated truly, or only the month was stated; or the publishers were not described correctly, that is, neither by the style of the firm, nor by the names of the individual partners (*b*). The innkeeper whose common law liability for the goods of his guests is limited, if he posts up a notice as required by the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 41, does not obtain the exoneration, if his notice is inaccurate in any material particular (*c*). So a declaration made by a lodger under the Lodger’s Goods Protection Act, 1871, must rigidly comply with the provisions of that Act, which is made for the benefit of the landlord as well as the lodger, and consequently a declaration made at the time of levying one distress will not protect the lodger

(*a*) 8 Geo. II. c. 13; *Newton v. Cowie*, 4 Bing. 234; *Brooks v. Cock*, 3 A. & E. 138; *Avanzo v. Mudie*, 10 Ex. 203.

(*b*) 5 & 6 Vict. c. 45, 7 Vict. c. 12; *Low v. Routledge*, 33 L. J. Ch. 725; *Wood v. Boosey*,

L. R. 2 Q. B. 340; *Mathieson v. Harrod*, L. R. 7 Eq. 270; *Henderson v. Maxwell*, 5 Ch. D. 892.

(*c*) *Spice v. Bacon*, 2 Ex. D. 463. See *Gregson v. Potter*, 4 Ex. D. 142; *Mather v. Brown*, 1 C. P. D. 596.

against a subsequent distress, but he must make a fresh declaration (a). The Act which, in authorising the confinement of lunatics, prohibited their reception in asylums without medical certificates in a given form, setting forth several particulars, and among them, the street and number of the house where the supposed lunatic was examined, made a strict compliance with those provisions imperative; so that a certificate which omitted the street and number of the house where the examination took place, was held insufficient to justify the detention of the lunatic (b). Where it was enacted that a person who objected to a voter's qualification might be heard in support of his objection, if he had given notice to the voter; and it was provided that, besides the ordinary way of serving it, the notice might be sent by post, addressed to his place of abode "as described" in the list of voters prepared by the clerk of the peace; it was held that to send by post a notice, not to the address so given, which was incorrect, but to the true address, was not a compliance with the Act, and therefore that the objector could not be heard on mere proof of posting the notice (c).

The Merchant Shipping Act of 1854, s. 55, enacting

(a) 34 & 35 Vict. c. 79, s. 1; 651.

Thwaites v. Wilding, 12 Q. B. D. 4.

(b) 16 & 17 Vict. c. 96; R. v. Pinder, 24 L. J. Q. B. 148. Comp. *Re Shuttleworth*, 9 Q. B.

(c) *Noseworthy v. Buckland*, L. R. 9 C. P. 233. See Gifford

v. *St. Luke's Chelsea*, 24 Q. B. D. 141; *Smith v. Huggett*, 11 C. B. N. S. 55.

that ships shall be transferred by an instrument in a form containing certain particulars, and executed with certain formalities, and registered, was deemed to render an unregistered mortgage of a ship inoperative (*a*); although there was no express declaration, as in the earlier and repealed Act in *pari materiâ*, that transfers in any other form should be null and void (*b*). So, it was held in one case, that the enactments of the Companies Clauses Consolidation Act of 1845, which prescribe the form in which contracts "may" be entered into on behalf of companies, were imperative (*c*); but in another it was thought that, being in the affirmative, they did not take away pre-existing rights and powers, and that a contract not complying with its provisions, but partly performed (*d*), might be enforced (*e*). When a company or public body is incorporated or established by statute for special purposes only, and is altogether the creature of statute law, the prescriptions for its acts and contracts are imperative and

(*a*) *Per* Lord Campbell in *The Liverpool Borough Bank v. Turner*, 2 De G. F. & J. 502. *Comp. Ward v. Beck*, 13 C. B. N. S. 668; *Stapleton v. Haymen*, 2 H. & C. 918; and 25 & 26 Vict. c. 63, s. 3. See *The Andalusian*, 3 P. D. 182; *Chasteauneuf v. Capeyrou*, 7 App. Cas. 127.

(*b*) *Comp. Le Feuvre v. Miller*, 8 E. & B. 321, *inf.*, 535.

(*c*) *Leominster Canal Co. v. Shrewsbury, etc. R. Co.*, 3 K. & J. 654.

(*d*) See *sup.*, p. 360, *etc.*

(*e*) *Wilson v. West Hartlepool Co.*, 2 De G. J. & S. 475. See *Green v. Jenkins*, 1 De G. F. & J. 454.

essential to their validity (*a*). If its articles of association under the statute prescribed the attestation of proxies, the omission of this formality would vitiate them (*b*). Such a company, empowered to borrow by mortgage, under certain circumstances, not more than a given sum, to be applied in carrying out the Act, would be limited to its statutory power, and all borrowing not so expressly authorised would be invalid as regarded the company (*c*).

So, enactments regulating the procedure in Courts seem usually to be imperative and not merely directory (*d*). If, for instance, an appeal from a decision be given, with provisions requiring the fulfilment of certain conditions, such as giving notice of appeal and entering into recognizances, or transmitting documents within a certain time, a strict compliance would be imperative, and non-compliance would be fatal to the appeal (*e*). The 57 Geo. III. c. 99, which required

(*a*) *Cope v. Thames Haven, etc. Co.*, 3 Ex. 841; *Diggle v. London & Blackwall R. Co.*, 5 Ex. 442; *Frend v. Dennet*, 4 C. B. N. S. 576. See also *Cornwall Mining Co. v. Bennett*, 5 H. & N. 423; *Irish Peat Co. v. Phillips*, 1 B. & S. 598; *Young v. Mayor of Leamington*, 8 App. Cas. 517; *Bottomley's Case*, 16 Ch. D. 681.

(*b*) *Harben v. Phillips*, 23 Ch. D. 14.

(*c*) *South Yorkshire R. Co. v. Great N. R. Co.*, 9 Ex. 55; *Chambers v. Manchester, etc. R. Co.*, 5 B. & S. 588. *Comp. Cork & Youghal R. Co.*, L. R. 4 Ch. 748. See *Re Coltman*, 19 Ch. D. 64.

(*d*) See, however, *inf.*, Sec. IV, p. 541.

(*e*) *R. v. Oxfordshire*, 1 M. & S. 446; *R. v. Carnarvon*, 4 B. & Ald. 86; *R. v. Bond*, 6 A. & E. 905; *R. v. Lancashire*, 8 E. &

that no action should be brought against a clergyman for any penalty incurred under it, until notice had been delivered to him, and also to the bishop "by leaving the same at the registry of his diocese," was held, with perhaps extreme rigour, not complied with by a delivery to the deputy registrar at the house of the latter, who carried it next day to the registry (*a*). The County Court rule, requiring that in actions to recover land the summons shall be delivered to the bailiff forty days at least before the return day, and be served within thirty-five days before that day, was similarly held imperative; so that if the summons were not delivered to the bailiff in due time, though the latter should serve it in the prescribed time, the judge would have no jurisdiction to try the cause (*b*).

The provision of the Public Health Act, 1875, that "every appointment of an arbitrator under the Act when made on behalf of the local authority shall be under their common seal, and on behalf of any other party under his hand," has similarly been held to be mandatory (*c*).

The same imperative effect seems, in general, pre-

B. 563; *Morgan v. Edwards*, 5 H. & N. 415; *Woodhouse v. Woods*, 29 L. J. M. C. 149; *Fox v. Wallis*, 2 C. P. D. 45; *R. v. Anglesey J. J.*, [1892] 2 Q. B. 29. (*b*) *Barker v. Palmer*, 8 Q. B. D. 9. See also *Brown v. Shaw*, 1 Ex. D. 425; *Tennant v. Rawlings*, 4 C. P. D. 133; *Williams v. Swansea Canal Co.*, L. R. 3 Ex. 158.

(*a*) *Vaux v. Vollans*, 4 B. & Ad. 525. (*c*) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 55, s. 180; *Re Gifford*, 20 Q. B. D. 368.

sumed to be intended, even where the observance of the formalities is not a condition exacted of the party seeking the benefit given by the statute, but a duty imposed on a Court or public officer in the exercise of the power conferred on him ; when no general inconvenience or injustice calls for a different construction. The 5 Eliz. c. 5 requiring that the writ de contumace capiendo shall be brought into the Queen's Bench, and be there opened in the presence of the judges, the omission of this apparently idle ceremony was deemed fatal to the validity of an arrest made in pursuance of the writ, though it had been enrolled in the Crown Office (*a*). An enactment which provided that every warrant issued by a Court should be under its seal, was equally imperative, and not only was a commitment under an unsealed warrant invalid, but the person who had obtained it without taking care that the Court performed its duty of sealing it, was liable in damage to the person arrested under it (*b*). This was hard on the former, but it was essential for the latter that the warrant should be duly authenticated. So, the strict observance of the provision in the Public Worship Act of 1874, requiring that the bishop shall send to the inculpated clergyman a copy of the representation of the illegal acts imputed to him, within twenty-one days, was held essential to

(*a*) *Re Dale*, 6 Q. B. D. 376. & 12 Vict. c. 63, s. 149; *R.*

(*b*) *Exp. Van Sandau, De v. Worksop Board*, 5 B. & G. 303. So, a rate under 11 S. 95.

the validity of the proceedings subsequently taken against him ; so that those proceedings were void where the copy had not been sent till after the prescribed time (a). If commissioners, authorised to fix the boundaries of a parish, were required by the Act to advertise the boundaries which they fixed, and to insert them in their award, and the Act declared that the boundaries "so fixed" should be conclusive ; a variation between the boundaries set forth in the award and those advertised would vitiate the award, as the requisites of the Act would not have been complied with (b). Where a statute enacts that convictions or orders shall be in a certain form, it is peremptory and not merely directory (c). The provision of the Union Assessment Act of 1862, regarding the deposit of the valuation list for inspection was held obviously imperative : for the omission would have left persons aggrieved by any alterations, without a timely opportunity for appealing (c).

On the other hand, where the prescriptions of a statute relate to the performance of a public duty ; and to affect with invalidity acts done in neglect of them would work serious general inconvenience or injustice to persons who have no control over those

(a) *Howard v. Bodington*, 2 Q. B. 960.

P. D. 203.

(c) *R. v. Chorlton Union*, L.

(b) *R. v. Washbrook*, 4 B. & R. 8 Q. B. 5 ; *R. v. Ingall*, 2 C. 732 ; *R. v. Arkwright*, 12 Q. B. D. 199.

intrusted with the duty, without promoting the essential aims of the Legislature ; they seem to be generally understood as mere instructions for the guidance and government of those on whom the duty is imposed, or, in other words, as directory only. The neglect of them may be penal (*a*), indeed, but it does not affect the validity of the act done in disregard of them. It has often been held, for instance, when an Act ordered a thing to be done by a public body or public officers, and pointed out the specific time when it was to be done, that the Act was directory only, and might be complied with after the prescribed time (*b*). Thus, the 13 Hen. IV. c. 7, which required justices to try rioters "within a month" after the riot, was held not to limit the authority of the justices to that space of time, but only to render them liable to a penalty for neglect (*c*). To hold that an Act which required an officer to prepare and deliver to another officer a list of voters, on or before a certain day, under a penalty, made a list not delivered till a later day invalid, would, in effect, put it in the power of the person charged with the duty of preparing it, to disfranchise the electors ; a conclusion too unreasonable for acceptance (*d*).

(*a*) See *ex. gr.* *Clarke v. B.* 910 ; *Hunt v. Hibbs*, 5 H. Gant, 8 Ex. 252. & N. 123 ; *Morgan v. Parry*, 17

(*b*) *Per* Littledale J. in *Smith v. Jones*, 1 B. & Ad. 334. C. B. 334 ; *Brumfitt v. Bremner*, 9 C. B. N. S. 1 ; *R. v. Lofthouse*,

(*c*) *R. v. Ingram*, 2 Salk. 593. L. R. 1 Q. B. 433 ; *R. v. Ingall*,

(*d*) *R. v. Rochester*, 7 E. & 2 Q. B. D. 199.

The Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, in providing that the Commissioners should direct the elections of one or more guardians for each parish included in the Union, did not make the constitution of the Board of Guardians invalid because one parish refused to elect a guardian (*a*). The enactment in the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act of 1871, which provides that within three months of the avoidance of a benefice, the bishop shall direct the surveyor to report the sum required to make good the dilapidations, is directory only, as to the time ; for it was a duty, not a power, which the statute imposed on the bishop ; and his neglect would otherwise have defeated the object of the statute by rendering the estate of the late incumbent exempt from liability for his dilapidations (*b*). The 5 Geo. IV. c. 84, having enacted that when any convict adjudged to transportation by any British Court out of the United Kingdom was brought to England to be transported, it should be lawful to imprison him in any place of confinement provided under the Act, it was held that if the place in which a prisoner was confined was not one of the appointed places, the officers concerned might be liable to censure, but the detention was not unlawful so as to entitle the prisoner to be discharged (*c*).

(*a*) *R. v. Todmorden*, 1 Q. B. 185. *Gleaves v. Marriner*, 1 Ex. D. 107.

(*b*) *Per Denman J. in Caldow v. Pixell*, 2 C. P. D. 562 ; (*c*) *Brenan's Case*, 10 Q. B. 492.

It is no impediment to this construction, that there is no remedy for non-compliance with the direction. The Act of 2 Hen. V., which requires justices to hold their sessions in the first week after Michaelmas, Epiphany, Easter, and the translation of St. Thomas the Martyr, has always been held to be merely directory (*a*). So, the 6 Rich. II. c. 5, which requires the justices to hold their sessions in the principal towns of their county, was held to be directory, not coercive (*b*). And yet it would be difficult to say that there would be any remedy against justices for appointing their sessions on other days or places than those prescribed by the statute (*c*).

The same construction was put on the 54 Geo. III. c. 84, which enacted that the Michaelmas sessions should be held in the week after the 11th of October, instead of the time then appointed (*d*); though such a construction would seem to have left the earlier law substantially unaltered, an intention not lightly to be imputed to the Legislature.

Though the 43 Eliz. c. 2 requires that overseers of the poor shall be appointed yearly in Easter week, they may lawfully be appointed at any other time of the year (*e*). In the same way, enactments fixing the time for the election of churchwardens and other

(*a*) 2 Hale, P. C. 50.

(*b*) Id. 39.

(*c*) *Per* Parke B. in *Gwynne v. Burnell*, 2 Bing. N. C. 39.

(*d*) *R. v. Leicester*, 7 B. &

C. 6.

(*e*) *R. v. Sparrow*, 2 Stra.

1123.

parochial and municipal officers, have been held to be directory only (*a*); or, at all events, if imperative, they would not be construed as depriving by implication the Court of Queen's Bench of the power of ordering an election at a different time from that prescribed, where there had been a wrongful omission to hold it at the proper time, and public inconvenience resulted from the omission (*b*). So, the regulations for the conduct of elections under the Ballot Act are so far directory only, that an election is not invalidated by the non-observance of them, unless the non-observance was of a character contrary to the principle of the Act, or might have affected the result of the election (*c*).

The 26 Geo. II. c. 14, which "required" the justices of the peace in England to settle a table of fees at their quarter sessions "held next after the "24th of June, 1753," and, such table being approved by the justices "at the next succeeding general "quarter sessions," to lay it before the judges at the next assize for confirmation, was held imperative as to the requirement that a table settled at one sessions should be confirmed at the next; so that one which had been submitted for confirmation at the

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) Anon., 1 Vent. 267; R. v. Corfe Mullen, 1 B. & Ad. 211; R. v. Denbighshire, 4 East, 142; R. v. Norwich, 1 B. & Ad. 310; R. v. Sneyd, 9 Dowl. 1001.</p> | <p>(<i>b</i>) R. v. Sparrow, 2 Stra. 1123; R. v. Rochester, 3 E. & B. 910. (<i>c</i>) Woodward v. Sarsons, L. R. 10 C. P. 733; Phillips v. Goff, 17 Q. B. D. 805.</p> |
|--|---|

next, but had not been confirmed till a later sessions, to which its consideration had been adjourned, was invalid (*a*). But it would be competent to the justices at quarter sessions to settle a table at the present time, though the statute required them to do it in 1753. It is a duty which they might be compelled to perform; and in this respect the statute is directory (*b*).

The usual provision in the commission of the peace that no justice named in it shall be capable of acting or authorised to act unless he shall have taken the oaths required by law, would lead to intolerable inconvenience and injustice if it were imperative, and struck with invalidity every act of an unqualified justice. If his acts were held void, it was pointed out by the King's Bench, all persons who acted in the execution of a warrant issued by him, would act without authority; a constable who arrested, and a gaoler who received the arrested person, under it, would be trespassers. Resistance to them would be lawful; everything done by them would be unlawful; and a constable, and the persons aiding him might become amenable even to a charge of murder, for acting under an authority which they reasonably considered themselves bound to obey, and of the invalidity of which they were wholly ignorant (*c*). Such con-

(*a*) *Bowman v. Blyth*, 7 E. & B. 26. See also *Williams v.* (*b*) *Lewis v. Davis*, L. R. 10 Ex. 86.

Swansea Navig., L. R. 3 Ex. 158. (*c*) 18 Geo. II. c. 20, 51 Geo.

sequences could not reasonably be supposed to have been intended; the interest of the public required that the acts should be sustained; and the just conclusion was that the Legislature intended by the prohibition only to impose a penalty for its infringement.

On the same general ground, the acts of aldermen who had been in office for several years without re-election, were held valid until their successors were appointed; the provision that they should be elected annually being regarded as directory only (*a*).

The provision in the Mutiny Acts that a recruit shall, on enlistment, be asked certain questions touching his personal history was considered merely directory, and the omission to ask them did not invalidate the enlistment (*b*). But another section provided that every person who received enlisting money should be deemed an enlisted soldier. The Parochial Assessment Act, 6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 96, after requiring that every poor rate should set forth a number of particulars given in a form, respecting the persons and properties rated, and that the church wardens and overseers should sign a declaration at the foot of the form, added that "otherwise the rate

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| III. c. 36; Margate Pier Co. | 13 Q. B. 687, and Holgate |
| <i>v. Hannam</i> , 3 B. & Ald. 266. | <i>v. Slight</i> , 2 L. M. & P. 662. |
| Comp. R. <i>v. Verelst</i> , 3 Camp. | See R. <i>v. Corfe Mullen</i> , 1 B. & |
| 432. | Ad. 211. |

| | |
|---|---|
| (<i>a</i>) Foot <i>v. Truro</i> , 1 Stra. | (<i>b</i>) Wolton <i>v. Gavin</i> , 16 Q. |
| 625. See also Scadding <i>v. Lorant</i> , | B. 48. |

“shall be of no force;” it was held that these last words were confined to the signatures, and did not affect the validity of the rate when the other requisites were neglected; because a different construction would have led to inconveniences which the Legislature must be presumed not to have intended (*a*). And the Public Health Act, 1848, in requiring that rates made under it should be published like a poor rate, was also held directory only; on the ground of the great inconvenience which would result from nullifying a rate whenever any of the particulars and forms required were not accurately given and followed (*b*). The latter Act, indeed, omitted the nullifying words which the former contained; and the omission was considered to show an intention that such an inconvenience should not follow (*c*).

The Act which enacted that no copy of a bill of sale shall be registered unless the original be produced to the officer duly stamped, did not invalidate the registration if the bill was not duly stamped when so produced. The object of the enactment was to protect the revenue; and this was thought sufficiently attained if the deed was afterwards duly stamped, without going to the extreme of holding the registration void (*d*).

(*a*) *R. v. Fordham*, 11 A. & 321.

E. 73. See *Cole v. Green*, 6 M. & Gr. 872.

(*b*) 11 & 12 Vict. c. 63; *Le Fouvre v. Miller*, 8 E. & B.

(*c*) See p. 449. *Comp. Liverpool Borough Bank v. Turner*, sup., 523-4.

(*d*) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 91;

The provision of the Insolvent Act, 7 Geo. IV. c. 57, which required the Court to cause notice of the filing of the insolvent's petition to be given to the creditors, was held to be merely a direction to the Court, and compliance with it not a condition precedent to the validity of the discharge (*a*).

So, an Act (29 Geo. II. c. 29) which empowered the quarter sessions to appoint treasurers, "first giving security to be accountable," was held directory as regards this provision, and as not affecting the validity of the appointment, which was held complete though no security was given (*b*).

It has been held that the neglect of merely formal requisites in keeping the register of the shareholders of a joint stock company, however fatal for some purposes, is immaterial as regards others. Thus, the provision that the register should be sealed, though essential to its being producible in evidence, is immaterial as regards making a person a shareholder, if there be in fact a book *bonâ fide* intended to be a register. But the neglect to number and appropriate the shares would be fatal (*c*). And the pro-

Bellamy v. Saull, 4 B. & S. 265.

(*a*) *Reid v. Croft*, 5 Bing. N. C. 68. So, as to sales of real estate (1 & 2 Vict. c. 110, s. 47), *Wright v. Maunder*, 4 Beav. 512.

(*b*) *R. v. Patteson*, 4 B. & Ad. 9.

(*c*) *Per Cur.* in *Henderson v. Royal British Bank*, 7 E. & B. 356; *Wolverhampton Waterworks Co. v. Hawksford*, 11 C. B. N. S. 456; *Southampton Dock Co. v. Richards*, 1 M. & Gr. 448; *London Grand Junction R. Co. v. Freeman*, 2 Id. 606.

visions in the Companies Act of 1862, directing that a register shall be kept of all mortgages and charges on the property of the company, to be open to the inspection of creditors, and imposing penalties on any of the company's officers who contravene them, are directory, so that they do not affect the validity of unregistered mortgages (*a*).

Where an Act provided that no beer license should be granted to any person who was not a resident occupier of the premises sought to be licensed, under the penalty of the license being null and void; and it required, further, that the applicant should produce to the licensing officer a certificate from the overseer of the parish, that he was such resident occupier; the latter provision was considered to be only directory, and a license obtained without the certificate, good. The omission, from the later passage, of the nullifying words which were appended to the former, were some indication of a difference of intention; besides, though it was reasonable that a license to a person not properly qualified should be void, it would hardly be reasonable that it should be void, if the holder was duly qualified, merely because the licensing officer had not been satisfied of the qualification by the particular means provided by the Act; which might have been wrongfully withheld

(*a*) *Wright v. Horton*, 12 App. 289. See another illustration Cas. 371; *Re Marine Mansions* in *Bosanquet v. Woodford*, 5 Q. Co., L. R. 4 Eq. 601; comp. *Re* B. 310. *Patent Bread Co.*, L. R. 7 Ch.

by the overseer (*a*). So, a provision that convictions for sporting without a certificate should be registered with the commissioners of taxes was held directory only, so that the omission to register it did not affect the validity of the conviction (*b*).

The Public Health Act of 1848, in empowering the Local Board of Health to enter into all contracts necessary for carrying the Act into execution, contains two provisions which may be taken as illustrating the distinction under consideration. It enacts that contracts exceeding £10 in value shall be sealed with the seal of the board; that they shall contain certain particulars; and that "every contract so entered into shall be binding; provided always . . . that before contracting for the execution of any work, the board shall obtain from the surveyor a written estimate of the probable expense of executing it and keeping it in repair." The first of these requisites was decided to be imperative, and a contract unsealed was consequently held inoperative against the board and the rates. The power to contract so as to bind the rates could not have been exercised if it had not been given by the Act; and, being entirely the creature of the statute, it could not be exercised in any other manner than that prescribed by the statute (*c*). But the provision

(*a*) *Thompson v. Harvey*, 4 K. 100.

H. & N. 254.

(*c*) 11 & 12 Vict. c. 63, s.

(*b*) *Mason v. Barker*, 1 C. & 85, repealed and re-enacted in

which required an estimate was held to be merely a direction or instruction for the guidance of the board, and not a condition precedent, the performance of which was essential to the validity of the contract (*a*). It was remarked that in the former case the party contracted with knew, or had the means of knowing, what forms were required by the Act, and could see to their observance; while in the latter, he had not, it was said, the same facility for ascertaining whether the board had consulted their surveyor. The non-observance of the latter provision would, however, probably impose on the board the penalty of having no remedy against their constituents for reimbursement (*b*).

It has been said that there is no such exact division of sections in Acts of Parliament into those that are directory and those that are imperative as is ordinarily assumed to be a categorical division which exhausts

substance by 38 & 39 Vict. c. 446.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 55, ss. 173, 174; <i>Freud v. Dennet</i> , 4 C. B. N. S. 576; | (<i>a</i>) <i>Nowell v. Mayor, etc.</i> , of Worcester, 9 Ex. 457; <i>Bonar v. Hunt v. Wimbledon Loc. Bd.</i> , 4 C. P. D. 48; <i>Ashbury v. Riche</i> , L. R. 7 H. L. 653; | (<i>a</i>) <i>Nowell v. Mayor, etc.</i> , of Worcester, 9 Ex. 457; <i>Bonar v. Hunt v. Wimbledon Loc. Bd.</i> , 4 C. P. D. 48; <i>Ashbury v. Riche</i> , L. R. 7 H. L. 653; |
| <i>Eaton v. Basker</i> , 7 Q. B. D. 529; <i>Young v. Leamington</i> , 8 App. Cas. 517. <i>Comp. Cole v. Green</i> , 6 M. & Gr. 872; <i>Melliss v. Shirley Loc. Bd.</i> , 16 Q. B. D. | <i>Mitchell</i> , 5 Ex. 415. (<i>b</i>) <i>Per Parke B.</i> , Id. See <i>East Anglian R. Co. v. E. C. R. Co.</i> , 11 C. B. 775; <i>McGregor v. Deal, etc. R. Co.</i> , 18 Q. B. 618; <i>Royal British Bank v. Turquand</i> , 5 E. & B. 248; <i>Nugent v. Smith</i> , 1 C. P. D. 423. | <i>Mitchell</i> , 5 Ex. 415. (<i>b</i>) <i>Per Parke B.</i> , Id. See <i>East Anglian R. Co. v. E. C. R. Co.</i> , 11 C. B. 775; <i>McGregor v. Deal, etc. R. Co.</i> , 18 Q. B. 618; <i>Royal British Bank v. Turquand</i> , 5 E. & B. 248; <i>Nugent v. Smith</i> , 1 C. P. D. 423. |

every possible class of section. A section may be imperative as regards the voluntary action of parties, but not so where such events happen that its provision cannot be attended to. The provision, therefore, of s. 42 (13) of the Metropolis Valuation Act, 1869, that the assessment sessions shall be held after February 1st, but so that all appeals shall be determined before March 31st, while imperatively requiring that the Court shall do all in its power to obey its mandate, would not operate so as to prevent a continuance of the sessions after March 30th, where, through necessity or default of the Court itself, whether culpable or not, the business was not then concluded. Parties who have done all that the statute requires of them are not to lose their right of appeal because the final hour has struck on March 30th. The enactment must be read, as all enactments are, subject to their not being made absurd by matters which never could have been within the calculation or consideration of the Legislature (α).

(α) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 67; R. [1893] 2 Q. B. 476.
v. London J. J. & London C. C.,

SECT. IV.—LEX NON COGIT AD IMPOSSIBILIA—CUILIBET
LICET RENUNTIARE JURI PRO SE INTRODUCTO.

Enactments which impose duties on conditions are, when these are not conditions precedent to the exercise of a jurisdiction, subject to the maxim that *lex non cogit ad impossibilia aut inutilia*. They are understood as dispensing with the performance of what is prescribed, when performance is idle or impossible (*α*).

Thus, where an Act provided that an appellant should send notice to the respondent of his having entered into a recognizance, in default of which the appeal should not be allowed, it was held that the death of the respondent before service was not fatal to the appeal, but dispensed with the service (*b*). In the same way, the provision of the 20 & 21 Vict. c. 43, which similarly makes the transmission of a case stated by justices to the Superior Courts, by the appellant, within three days from receiving it, a

(*a*) As to performance, where the duty has not been imposed by superior authority, but has been voluntarily assumed, see *Paradine v. Jane*, Aleyn, 26, and the cases cited in *Hall v. Wright*, E. B. & E. 746. See also *Taylor v. Caldwell*, 3 B. & S. 826; *Boast v. Firth*, L. R. 4 C. P. 1; *Appleby v. Myers*, L. R. 1 C. P. 615, 2 Id. 651; *Clifford v. Watts*, L. R. 5 C. P. 577; *Howell v. Coupland*, 1 Q. B. D. 258; and *Nichols v. Marsland*, 2 Ex. D. 4; *Jacobs v. Crédit Lyonnais*, 12 Q. B. D. 589.

(*b*) *R. v. Leicestershire*, 15 Q. B. 88. See also *Brumfitt v. Roberts*, L. R. 5 C. P. 224.

condition precedent to the hearing of the appeal (*a*), was held dispensed with, when the Court was closed during the three days; since compliance was impossible (*b*).

In such cases, the provision or condition is dispensed with, when compliance is impossible in the nature of things. It would seem to be sometimes equally so, where compliance was, though not impossible in this sense, yet impracticable, without any default on the part of the person on whom the duty was thrown. An Act, for instance, which made actual payment of the rent, as well as the renting of a tenement, essential to the acquisition of a settlement, would probably be complied with, if the rent was tendered, though it was not accepted (*c*). If the respondent in an appeal kept out of the way to avoid service of the notice of appeal, or at all events could not be found after due diligence in searching for him, the service required by the statute would probably be dispensed with (*d*). So, if the appellant was entitled to appeal,

(*a*) *Morgan v. Edwards*, 5 H. & S. 915; *R. v. Bloomsbury & N.* 415; *Woodhouse v. Woods*, 29 L. J. M. C. 149; *Stone v. Dean*, E. B. & E. 504; *Norris v. Carrington*, 16 C. B. N. S. 10; *Exp. Harrison*, 2 De G. & J. 229.

(*b*) *Mayer v. Harding*, L. R. 2 Q. B. 410; see *R. v. Allan*, 4 B.

& S. 915; *R. v. Bloomsbury County Court Judge*, 17 Q. B. D. 788. See also *R. v. London J. J. & London C. C.*, [1893] 2 Q. B. 476.

(*c*) *Per Bayley J. in R. v. Amphill*, 2 B. & C. 847.

(*d*) *Per Cur. in Morgan v. Edwards*, and *per Crompton J.*

subject to the condition of giving security for costs within a certain time, he would be held to have complied with the condition, if he offered and was ready to complete the security within the limited time, though it was, owing to the act of the Court, or of the respondent, not completed till long after (*a*). Indeed, the Courts will exercise a discretion in extending time (when not going to the jurisdiction) where the non-compliance arose from excusable mistake (*b*).

Where, however, the act or thing required by the statute is a condition precedent to the jurisdiction of the tribunal, compliance cannot be dispensed with; and if it be impossible, the jurisdiction fails. It would not be competent to a Court to dispense with what the Legislature had made the indispensable foundation of its jurisdiction. Thus, the Act which enacts that justices, at the hearing of a bastardy summons, "shall hear the evidence" of the mother, and such other evidence as she may adduce; and which authorises them to make an affiliation order "if the mother's evidence be corroborated in some material particular by other testimony," makes the evidence of the mother so essential to the jurisdiction, that no order could be made without it,

and Hill J. in *Woodhouse v. 3 Q. B. 173*; and see *R. v. Woods*, ubi sup. See also *Syred Aston*, 1 L. M. & P. 491.
v. Carruthers, E. B. & E. 469. (*b*) *Cusack v. L. & N. W. R. Co.*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 347.
 (*a*) *Waterton v. Baker*, L. R.

although the woman died before the hearing (a). So, under the County Courts Act, 1875, which empowers a party to move the appellate Court or a judge at chambers for a new trial "within eight days "after the decision," the time could not be extended by either Court or judge (b). Under the 13th section of the Admiralty Act of 1861, which gives the Court of Admiralty the same powers, when a vessel or its proceeds are under arrest, as the Court of Chancery has under the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854, over suits for limiting the liability of ship-owners, no jurisdiction could be exercised by the former Court, when the ship was lost. The jurisdiction of the Court depended on the ship, or the proceeds of its sale, being under arrest; and the shipowner could not give it jurisdiction by paying into Court a sum equivalent to its value or proceeds (c).

Another maxim which sanctions the non-observance of a statutory provision, is that, *cuiuslibet licet renuntiare juri pro se introducto*. Every one has a right to waive, and to agree to waive the advantage

(a) *R. v. Armitage*, L. R. 7 10 P. D. 110; *Ashdown v. Q. B.* 773. *Comp. Ditton's Case*, 2 Salk. 490, *supra*, p. 288. *Curtis*, 31 L. J. M. C. 216; *Edwards v. Roberts*, [1891] 1

(b) 38 & 39 Vict. c. 50; *Q. B.* 302.
Brown v. Shaw, 1 Ex. D. 425; (c) *James v. L. & S. W. R. Tennant v. Rawlings*, 4 C. P. D. Co., L. R. 7 Ex. 287. See also *R. v. Belton*, 11 Q. B. 379; *R. v. Shurmer*, 17 Q. B. D. 323.
 133. See also *R. v. Salop*, 6 Q. B. D. 669; *Ahier v. Ahier*,

of a law or rule made solely for the benefit and protection of the individual, in his private capacity (*a*), and which may be dispensed with without infringing on any public right or public policy. Thus a person may agree to waive the benefit of the Statute of Limitations (*b*). The trustees of a turnpike road may, in demising the tolls, waive the provision of the Act which requires that the demise shall be signed by the sureties of the lessee (*c*). A passenger may waive the benefit of an enactment which entitles him to carry so many pounds of luggage with him; and he does so, it may be added, by taking a ticket with the express condition that he shall carry no luggage (*d*). The only person intended to be benefited by such an enactment is, obviously, the passenger himself; and no consideration of public policy is involved in it (*e*). A statute authorising a trading company to levy tolls within a specified maximum does not bind them to exact uniform tolls from all persons alike; but they are entitled, in the absence of an express provision requiring equality, to remit any part of the tolls to particular persons, at their discretion (*f*).

(*a*) *McAllister v. Rochester*
(Bp.), 5 C. P. D. 194.

(*b*) *E. I. Co. v. Paul*, 7 Moo.
P. C. 85; *Lade v. Trill*, 6 Jur.
272, *per Knight Bruce V.C.*

(*c*) *Markham v. Stanford*, 14
C. B. N. S. 376.

(*d*) *Rumsey v. N. E. R. Co.*,
14 C. B. N. S. 641.

(*e*) *Id. per Willes J.*

(*f*) *Hungerford Market Co.*
v. City Steam Boat Co., 3 E. &
E. 365.

When a person does waive the benefit of any such law, he cannot recall the concession, after it has been acted on, and insist on the right which the rule gave him. A tenant, for instance, whose goods have been distrained, may waive the enactment which requires an appraisalment before the sale of the goods; and he could not, after the sale, be heard to complain that no appraisalment had been made (a). Where a question between two railway companies has been tried on the merits without either party raising the point that the matter ought to be referred to arbitration, it is too late on the hearing of an appeal to insist that the case should be so referred (b).

The regulations concerning the procedure and practice of Civil Courts may in the same way, when not going to the jurisdiction, be waived by those for whose protection they were intended. Thus, the provisions of the Act of 4 Anne, c. 16, which required that a plea in abatement should be verified by affidavit, might be waived by the plaintiff (c). So, the 13 & 14 Vict. c. 61, s. 14, which gave an appeal from a County Court, provided the appellant, within ten days, gave notice of appeal and security for costs; and after directing that the appeal should be in the form of a case, enacted that no judgment of a County

(a) *Bishop v. Bryant*, 6 C. & R., 40 Ch. D. 100.
P. 484. And see *Atkins v. Kilby*, 11 A. & E. 777. (c) *Graham v. Ingleby*, 1 Ex. 651.
(b) *L. C. & D. R. v. S. E.*

Court Judge should be removed into any other Court, except in the manner and under the provisions above mentioned; it was held that the want of due notice and security might be waived. The provision was intended for the benefit of the respondent, and was not a matter of public concern (*a*). So, a defendant in an action in a County Court which has jurisdiction over the case subject to leave being given, may waive that want of leave (*b*); and a defendant, even in a criminal case before justices if the subject matter be within their jurisdiction, may waive any irregularity in the summons, or indeed dispense with the summons altogether; and he does so in such cases not, indeed, by appearing merely (*c*), but by appearing and entering on the case on its merits. The tribunal having jurisdiction over the matter, he would not be allowed to take his chance of prevailing on the merits, and to reserve his objections to a mere preliminary irregularity (*d*). So, where a statute requires justices

(*a*) *Park Gate Iron Co. v. Coates*, L. R. 5 C. P. 634. See also *R. v. Long*, 1 Q. B. 740; *Tyerman v. Smith*, 6 E. & B. 719; *Freeman v. Read*, 4 B. & S. 174; *Palmer v. Metrop. R. Co.*, 31 L. J. Q. B. 259; *Re Regent U. S. Stores*, L. R. 8 Ch. 75.

(*b*) *Moore v. Gamgee*, 25 Q. B. D. 244.

(*c*) *R. v. Carnarvon*, 5 Nev. & M. 364; *R. v. Shaw*, 34 L. J. M. C. 169; *R. v. Hughes*, 4 Q. B. D. 614. *Comp. Dixon v. Wells*, 25 Q. B. D. 249.

(*d*) *R. v. Barret*, 1 Salk. 383; *R. v. Johnson*, 1 Stra. 261; *R. v. Aikin*, 3 Burr. 1785; *R. v. Stone*, 1 East, 639; *R. v. Berry*, 28 L. J. M. C. 86; *R. v. Fletcher*, L. R. 1 C. C. 320; *R. v. Smith*,

to make known to a party his right to appeal, and the steps necessary to carry out this right, such as giving notice of appeal and entering into recognizances, the party may waive this provision (*a*).

But when public policy requires the observance of the provision, it cannot be waived by an individual. *Privatorum conventio juri publico non derogat* (*b*). Private compacts are not permitted either to render that sufficient, between themselves, which the law declares essentially insufficient; or to impair the integrity of a rule necessary for the common welfare; such, for instance, as the enactment which requires the attestation of wills (*c*). Thus, the invalidity of the service of a writ on a Sunday cannot be waived; for it is a matter of public policy that no such proceeding should take place on Sunday (*d*). It has been held that the maxim *volenti non fit injuria* is not to be applied to cases of injury occasioned by the breach of a statutory duty imposed for the benefit of others as well as the injured party (*e*). On the same principle a public body, such as a local board, which

Id. 110; *R. v. Widdop*, L. R. 2 C. C. 3; *Bolton v. Bolton*, 2 Ch. D. 217.

(*a*) *R. v. Yorkshire*, 3 M. & S. 493; and does so by declaring that he does not intend to appeal.

(*b*) Dig. 50, 17, 45.

(*c*) *Per* Wilson J. in *Haberg-*

ham v. Vincent, 2 Ves. jun. 227. See New York Civ. Code, Art. 1968, n. 2.

(*d*) *Taylor v. Phillips*, 3 East, 155.

(*e*) *Baddeley v. Earl Granville*, 19 Q. B. D. 423; *Thomas v. Quartermaine*, 18 Q. B. D. 685.

is authorised to make bye-laws, cannot dispense with them in particular cases, the bye-laws not being for its benefit but for that of the public (*a*). It is said to be a general understanding in the profession that a prisoner can consent to nothing; at least in the course of his trial (*b*). In criminal matters, a person cannot waive what the law requires (*c*). Where, upon a trial for felony, the jury was discharged, and, at the new trial, some of the witnesses, after being sworn, had their evidence read over to them by the judge from his notes, and the counsel for the Crown and the prisoner had afterwards liberty to examine and cross-examine them; it was held that this course of proceeding vitiated the trial, and that the consent or acquiescence of the prisoner did not cure the irregularity (*d*). The object of a criminal trial, it was observed, was the administration of justice in a course as free from doubt or chance of miscarriage as human administration of it can be; not the interests of either party.

Consent cannot give jurisdiction (*e*); and

(*a*) *Re McIntosh*, 61 L. J. 528; *per* Pollock C.B. and Q. B. 164. Alderson B. in *Graham v.*

(*b*) *Per Cur.* in *R. v. Bertrand*, Ingleby, 1 Ex. 651. Comp. R. L. R. 1 P. C. 520. *v. Thornhill*, 8 C. & P. 574.

(*c*) *Per M. Smith J.* in *Park Gate Iron Co. v. Coates*, L. R. 5 488. See Exp. Best, 18 Ch. D. C. P. 639. (*e*) *Lawrence v. Wilcock*, 11

(*d*) *R. v. Bertrand*, *ubi sup.*; A. & E. 941; *Lismore v. Beadle*, and see *R. v. Bloxham*, 6 Q. B. 1 Dowl. N. S. 566; Exp. Robert-

therefore any statutory objection which goes to the jurisdiction does not admit of waiver. Thus, the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, s. 33, which empowers either party, after the determination of an information by justices to apply to the Court to state a case, requires that the application should be made to all who heard it, and the objection that the case was stated by some only of them cannot be waived, because it goes to the jurisdiction (*a*); and the provision of the 20 & 21 Vict. c. 43, which requires the appellant from a decision of justices to transmit the case in three days to the Court of Appeal, could not be waived by the respondent, on the ground either that it went to the jurisdiction, or that it related to a criminal case, or that the justices had an interest in the observance of the rule (*b*). So, a provision that a summons shall be served within a certain time goes to the jurisdiction, and must be observed (*c*).

It may be added here, that a person is sometimes estopped by his own conduct from availing himself

son, 20 Eq. 733; *Jackson v. Great N. Committee v. Inett*, 2 Beaumont, 11 Ex. 300. Q. B. D. 284; *R. v. Hughes*, 4

(*a*) 42 & 43 Vict. c. 49; Q. B. D. 614. See the remarks Westmore *v. Paine*, [1891] 1 in *Park Gate Iron Co. v. Coates*, Q. B. 482. L. R. 5 C. P. 634, *dubit. Keat-*

(*b*) *Morgan v. Edwards*, 5 H. & N. 415; *Peacock v. R.*, 4 C. C. P. D. 80. *ing J.*; *Bennett v. Atkins*, 4

B. N. S. 264. Comp. *Peters v.* (*c*) *Dixon v. Wells*, 25 Q. B. Sheehan, 10 M. & W. 213; D. 249.

of legislative provisions intended for his benefit. For instance, a prisoner for debt, representing a person to be an attorney, to attest a warrant of attorney, who did not belong to that profession, could not afterwards be allowed to impeach the warrant on the ground of inadequate attestation (*a*); and the grantee of an annuity, on whom the duty is cast of enrolling the deed of grant, would be estopped from taking any advantage from his neglect to enrol it (*b*).

Where an Act of Parliament compels a breach of a private contract, the contract is impliedly repealed by the Act, so far as the latter extends; or the breach is excused, or is considered as not falling within the contract (*c*). The intervention of the Legislature, in altering the situation of the contracting parties, is analogous to a convulsion of nature, against which they, no doubt, may provide; but if they have not provided, it is generally to be considered as excepted out of the contract (*d*). Thus, where land was leased to certain persons, who covenanted to build a workhouse on it, and not to use

(*a*) *Joyce v. Booth*, 1 B. & P. 3 M. D. & D. 380, and Exp. 97; *Cox v. Cannon*, 4 Bing. N. Greener, 15 Ch. D. 457.

C. 453.

(*c*) *Per Cur.* in *Brewster v.*

(*b*) *Molton v. Camroux*, 4 Ex.

Kitchell, 1 Salk. 198.

17; *Turner v. Browne*, 3 C. B.

157. See also *Re Connan*, 20

Q. B. D. 690; Exp. Musgrave,

(*d*) *Per Pollock C.B.* in *Os-*

wald *v. Berwick*, 3 E. & B.

653.

the house or land for any other purpose than the support of the poor of the parish; and the Poor Law Commissioners, under the 4 & 5 Will. IV. c. 76, incorporated the parish in an Union, and removed the paupers to the Union workhouse, whereupon the house was shut up and the land was let at a rack rent, which was applied in aid of the rates; it was held that the covenant had not been broken, or that the breach was excused by legislative compulsion (*a*).

If a man covenants not to do a thing which was unlawful at the time of the covenant, and an Act subsequently makes it lawful only, but not imperative, to do it; the covenant is unaffected by the Act (*b*). Where a lessee covenanted, for himself and his "assigns," that he would not build on the demised premises; and he was afterwards compelled, under an Act of Parliament, to sell the land to a railway company, who built on it; it was held that the company was not an "assign" within the meaning of the covenant. The Legislature, it was considered, had, in compelling the sale, created a kind of assign not contemplated by either lessor or lessee when the contract was entered into; and so, the lessee could not justly be held responsible for the acts of such an assign. It was not reasonable to impute to the Legislature the intention that he

(*a*) *Doe v. Rugeley*, 6 Q. B. 107. See *D. of Devonshire v. Barrow Steel Co.*, 2 Q. B. D. 286. (*b*) *Per Cur. in Brewster v. Kitchell*, 1 Salk. 198.

should remain liable for the non-performance of that which it had, itself, prevented him from performing (*a*).

(*a*) *Baily v. De Crespigny*, of London, 9 C. B. N. S. 726 ;
 L. R. 4 Q. B. 180. See also *Newington v. Cottingham*, 12
Wadham v. P. M. Gen., L. R. Ch. D. 725.
 6 Q. B. 644 ; *Brown v. Mayor*

CHAPTER XIII.

SECTION I.—CONTRACTS CONNECTED WITH ILLEGAL ACTS.

It is, and has always been, an established rule of law that no action can be maintained on a contract made for or about any matter or thing which is prohibited and made unlawful by statute. Such a contract is void (*a*). What has been done in contravention of an Act of Parliament cannot be made the subject of an action (*b*). Thus, as the Metropolitan Building Act prohibits the use of combustible materials for building walls in the metropolis, the builder of any such walls could not maintain an action for the price of erecting them (*c*). As the statute 55 Geo. III. c. 194, s. 14, forbids medical practice by unqualified persons, a contract made between such a person and a duly qualified medical practitioner, that the latter should assist the former in carrying on a medical

(*a*) *Bartlett v. Vinor*, Carth. in *Langton v. Hughes*, 1 M. & S. 252; *per* Bowen L.J. in *Melliss* 593.

v. Shirley, 16 Q. B. D. 453.

(*c*) *Stevens v. Gourley*, 7

(*b*) *Per* Lord Ellenborough C. B. N. S. 99, sup., p. 519.

practice, would be void for illegality (*a*). It would seem, however, that this would not be so if the unqualified person did not himself practise, but merely employed a duly qualified assistant to do so. A waterman being prohibited by statute from taking an apprentice, unless he was the occupier of a tenement wherein to lodge him; it was held that no settlement was gained by service under an indenture of apprenticeship made contrary to this provision (*b*).

When a penalty is imposed for doing or omitting an act, the act or omission is thereby prohibited and made unlawful; for a statute would not inflict a penalty on what was lawful (*c*). Consequently, when the thing in respect of which the penalty is imposed is a contract, it is illegal and void. In the case cited above, the Act had declared that it should not be lawful to take the apprentice, and imposed a penalty for doing so (*d*); and in another, where service under an indenture of apprenticeship as a sweep was similarly treated, the statute had not only declared the apprenticeship "void," but imposed a penalty on the master (*e*). The Joint Stock Companies Act, 7 & 8 Vict. c. 110, s. 24, in enacting that every promoter of a company

(*a*) *Davies v. Mackuna*, 29 Ch. D. 596. Hatherley in *Re Cork, etc.* R. Co., L. R. 4 Ch. 748.

(*b*) 10 Geo. II. c. 31; *R. v. Gravesend*, 3 B. & Ad. 240. (*d*) *R. v. Gravesend*, ubi sup. (*e*) 28 Geo. III. c. 48; *R. v.*

(*c*) *Fer* Lord Holt in *Bartlett v. Vinor*, ubi sup.; *per* Lord Hipswell, 8 B. & C. 466.

concerned in making contracts on its behalf before its provisional registration, should be subject to a penalty of £25, impliedly rendered every such contract illegal and therefore void (a). So, the 25 & 26 Vict. c. 89, in enacting that no company of more than twenty persons should be formed for carrying on any business for gain, unless it were registered, rendered illegal and void all contracts for carrying on its business if the company was not registered (b). The Act which imposes a penalty on certain classes of persons for exercising their ordinary callings on Sunday, not only subjects the offender to the penalty, but invalidates every contract made in the course of any such prohibited exercise, so far as the right of the offender, and of any person with whom he contracted, if privy to what made it illegal, are concerned (c).

The Highway Act, 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 50, s. 46, in imposing a penalty of £10 on a road surveyor who had any share in a contract for supplying work or materials, or horse labour, for any of his highways, without the written license of two justices, was equally fatal to his recovering any payment for

(a) *Bull v. Chapman*, 8 Ex. Shaw *v. Benson*, 11 Q. B. D. 444; and see *Abbot v. Rogers*, 563.
16 C. B. 277.

(b) *Re Padstow Assur. Assoc.*, C. 406; *Smith v. Sparrow*, 4 L. R. 20 Ch. D. 137; *Jennings v. Hammond*, 9 Q. B. D. 225; (c) *Fennell v. Ridler*, 5 B. & C. 406; *Bing*, 84; *Bloxsome v. Williams*, 3 B. & C. 232.

such supplies or services (*a*). The 50th section of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854, which enacts that the certificate of a ship's registry shall be used only for the navigation of the ship, and imposes a penalty on any person in possession of it, who refuses to give it up to the person entitled to its custody for the purposes of navigation, impliedly prohibits its use for any other purpose; rendering a pledge of it illegal and void, and giving no right to detain it even against the pledgor, if the right of possession and property is vested in him (*b*).

Further, any contract connected with or growing out of an act which is illegal is also invalid. Thus, a contract to dance at a theatre not duly licensed could not be enforced by action (*c*). It being unlawful for any election agent, except the expense agent, to make any payments on behalf of a candidate, even for current expenses, an agent who made any such payments could not, for this reason, recover the amount from his principal (*d*). So, a contract to make bets (which are, by 8 & 9 Vict. c. 109, irrecoverable) cannot be enforced (*e*). It is a contract to make void contracts. But as a betting contract

(*a*) *Barton v. Pigott*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 86. *v. Yates*, 8 A. & E. 129; *Elliot v. Richardson*, L. R. 5 C. P.

(*b*) *Wiley v. Crawford*, 1 B. & S. 253. 744. (*d*) 26 & 27 Vict. c. 29; *Re*

(*c*) *Gallini v. Laborie*, 5 T. R. 242. See also *De Begnis v. Parker*, 21 Ch. D. 408.

Armistead, 10 Bing. 107; *Levy* (*e*) *Cohen v. Kittell*, 22 Q. B. D. 680.

is void only and not illegal, when a bet has been received by an agent the principal may recover it from him (*a*).

As the Pawnbrokers' Act, 39 & 40 Geo. III. c. 99, requires that for the better manifesting by whom the business of a pawnbroker is carried on, every person who carries it on shall cause his name to be painted over his shop; an agreement for a partnership in that business, which included a stipulation that the name of one of the partners should not be painted up, would be illegal and void (*b*). And so would be an agreement to let premises to a person, with the object of enabling him to sell spirituous liquors there without a license (*c*).

Where an Act provided that before a ship sailed, the master should obtain the clearing officer's certificate that the whole cargo was below deck, and forbade him, under a penalty, to sail without the certificate or to place any cargo on deck; a voyage in contravention of these provisions would be illegal, and a policy of insurance on the cargo effected by its owner, who was privy to the transaction, void (*d*).

(*a*) *Bridger v. Savage*, 15 Q. B. D. See also *Read v. Anderson*, 13 Q. B. D. 779, and the statute 55 Vict. c. 9; *Lilley v. Rankin*, 56 L. J. Q. B. 248.

Howden, 12 Cl. & F. 237; *Fraser v. Hill*, 1 Macq. H. L. C. 392.

(*c*) *Ritchie v. Smith*, 6 C. B. 462.

(*b*) *Armstrong v. Lewis*, 2 C. & M. 274; *Warner v. Armstrong*, 3 M. & K. 45; *Gordon v.*

(*d*) See the two cases of *Cunard v. Hyde*, 2 E. & E. 1, and E. B. & E. 670; *Wilson v. Rankin*, L. R. 1 Q. B. 162; *Dud-*

Where a statute prohibited brewers from using any ingredients but malt and hops in brewing beer, it was held that a druggist who sold drugs to a brewer with the knowledge that they were to be used in making beer, contrary to the Act, and under circumstances which made him a participator in the illegal transaction, could not recover the price of the drugs (*a*).

But mere knowledge of the purposed illegality, without actual participation or privity in it, would not affect the contract. Thus, a sale of goods in a foreign country, with the knowledge that the purchaser intended to smuggle them into England, but without any participation in the transaction, would not be invalid (*b*).

The question has frequently arisen, when an Act prescribes regulations, forms, or other attendant circumstances, more or less immediately connected

geon v. Pembroke, L. R. 9 Q. B. 581; *Atkinson v. Abbott*, 11 East, 135.

(*a*) See *Holman v. Johnson*, 1 Cowp. 341; *Abbot v. Rogers*, 16 C. B. 277; *Langton v. Hughes*, 1 M. & S. 593; *Hodgson v. Temple*, 5 Taunt. 503; *Paxton v. Popham*, 9 East, 408; *Gaslight Co. v. Turner*, 6 Bing. N. C. 324. See also *Fisher v. Bridges*, 3 E. & B. 642; *Geere v. Mare*, 2 H. & C. 339; *Clay v. Ray*, 17 C. B. N. S. 188; *Hobbs v. Henning*, 17 C. B. N. S. 791; *Beeston v. Beeston*, 1 Ex. D. 13; *Brooker v. Wood*, 5 B. & Ad. 1052.

(*b*) *Holman v. Johnson*, Cowp. 341; comp. *Waymell v. Read*, 5 T. R. 599; *Lightfoot v. Tenant*, 1 Bos. & P. 51. See *Hobbs v. Henning*, 17 C. B. N. S. 791.

with contracts, either with or without penalties for non-compliance, whether a contract entered into in disregard of any of them is thereby prohibited, and so illegal, or whether the object of the Act is not sufficiently attained by the imposition of the penalty ; and the chief test for its decision seems to be whether the provisions have, or not, some object of general policy, which requires that the contract should be invalidated.

Thus, it has been held that enactments which required, under penalties, that all bricks made for sale should be of at least certain specified dimensions (*a*) ; or that persons who sold corn, except by certain measures, should be liable to a penalty (*b*) ; or that vendors of coals should, under a penalty, deliver, with the coals sold, a ticket setting forth their weight and the number of sacks in which they are contained (*c*) ; or that farmers and others should sell butter in firkins of a certain size, branded with their own and the maker's names (*d*) ; prohibited all contracts made in disregard of such provisions, and made them void, so that no action could be maintained for the price of the goods sold. On the same ground, where printers were required to affix

(*a*) *Law v. Hodson*, 11 East, 192 ; *Cundell v. Dawson*, 4 C. 300. B. 376.

(*b*) *Tyson v. Thomas*, McCl. & Yo. 119. (*d*) *Forster v. Taylor*, 5 B. & Ad. 887.

(*c*) *Little v. Poole*, 9 B. & C.

their names to the books which they printed, it was held that a printer could not maintain an action for his work and materials in printing a book in which he had omitted to comply with this statutory provision(a). The policy of these Acts was to prevent all such dealings ; and it would have been imperfectly attained, if the sellers had been merely subjected to a penalty, while the purchasers remained liable to be sued.

The same stringent effect has been given to enactments which imposed, under a penalty, regulations relating to personal qualification. Thus, an Act which imposed a penalty on an unqualified person who drew conveyances for reward, would invalidate any contract with him for such a purpose (b). So, an Act which imposed penalties on persons for acting as brokers in the City of London, who had not been admitted and paid certain fees for the benefit of the City (inasmuch as its object was, not the enrichment of the citizens of London, but the protection of the public by preventing improper persons from acting as brokers), was held to invalidate the dealings of an unqualified broker, so far as to prevent him from recovering payment for his services in that capacity (c). But it would not affect his right to recover from his employer money paid on his behalf to complete

(a) *Bensley v. Bignold*, 5 B. & A. 335 ; and see *Stephens v. Crowland Gas Co.*, 10 Ex. 293.

Robinson, 2 C. & J. 209.

(c) 6 Anne, c. 16 ; *Cope v.*

(b) 44 Geo. III. c. 98 ; *Taylor Rowlands*, 2 M. & W. 149.

the irregular purchase; for this was a transaction distinct from his character of broker (*a*). It has been held that an enactment, which provided that no person interested in a contract with a company should be capable of being a director, and that if a director of a company were concerned in any contract with the company, he should cease to be a director, did not, at law, invalidate such a contract (*b*). In equity, the contract would be void (*c*).

But where the object of the Act is sufficiently attained without giving the prohibition so stringent an effect, and where it is also collateral to or independent of the contract, the statute is understood as not affecting the validity of the contract.

Thus it has been held by the House of Lords that the provision of s. 43 of the Companies Act, 1862, which imposes a penalty of £50 upon every officer of a limited company who knowingly and wilfully authorises or permits the non-registration of mortgages, or charges specifically affecting the property of a company, is not to be construed as also invalidating debentures issued to a director, because he has omitted to register them (*d*).

- | | |
|---|--|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>Smith v. Lindo</i> , 5 C. B. | <i>Barbour</i> , New York R. 397. |
| N. S. 587. <i>Comp. Steel v.</i> | (<i>c</i>) <i>Aberdeen R. Co. v. Blaikie</i> , |
| <i>Henley</i> , 1 C. & P. 574; <i>Latham</i> | 1 Macq. H. L. C. 461. |
| <i>v. Hide</i> , 1 C. & M. 128. | (<i>d</i>) 25 & 26 Vict. c. 89, s. 43; |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Foster v. Oxford, etc. R.</i> | <i>Wright v. Horton</i> , 12 App. Cas. |
| <i>Co.</i> , 13 C. B. 200. <i>Comp.</i> | 371. |
| <i>Barton v. Port Jackson Co.</i> , 17 | |

And where an Act subjected every licensed distiller to a penalty of £200, if he sold spirits by retail, or even wholesale, anywhere within two miles of the distillery, and required that every license should state the name and abode of every person licensed; it was held that the omission, in the license, of the name and abode of one of the five partners in a distillery, and the retailing of spirits by him, did not affect the sale, so as to prevent the partnership from recovering the price (*a*). So, the provisions of an Act which imposed penalties on every dealer in tobacco who omitted to paint his name over the entrance of his premises, or who dealt in tobacco without a license, were understood as not affecting the validity of a contract by a tobacconist who had neglected to comply with them. They were mere fiscal regulations, the breach of which was unconnected with the contract; their object was to protect the revenue, and this was completely attained by the enforcement of the penalty (*b*). On the same ground it has been held that the omission of a broker to send to his principal a stamped contract note in respect of a sale of stock on the Stock Exchange, as required by s. 17, sub-s. 1 of the Revenue Act, 1888, though subjecting the former to a penalty of £20 does not prevent him

(*a*) *Brown v. Duncan*, 10 B. 3 B. & Ad. 221; *Bailey v. Harris*, & C. 93; *Hodgson v. Temple*, 5 12 Q. B. 905.
Taunt. 181; *Johnson v. Hudson*, (*b*) *Smith v. Mawhood*, 14 M.
 11 East, 180; *Wetherell v. Jones*, & W. 452.

from recovering from the latter his commission on such sale (a).

The Pawnbrokers' Act, 39 & 40 Geo. III. c. 99, already referred to, affords an illustration of the two classes of cases. It requires a pawnbroker to paint his name and business over his door: and it also requires that before he makes any advance on a pledge, he shall make certain inquiries of the pledgor as to his name, abode, and condition in life, and shall enter the results of them in his books and on the duplicate. A breach of the former provision would not affect the validity of a pledge; but a breach of the latter would do so, for they are directly and immediately connected with the contract (b). The object of the Legislature by such regulations, which was to guard against abuses, would be but imperfectly attained if the contract were held good.

It was once considered a rigid rule that when the bad part of a contract was made illegal or void by statute, the whole instrument was invalidated; while, if the invalid part was void at common law, the remainder of the instrument was valid; a statute being, it was said, strict law, while the common law divided according to common reason (c); or again, the former

(a) 51 & 52 Vict. c. 8; Scott, 794.

Learoyd v. Bracken, [1894] 1
Q. B. 114.

(c) Norton v. Simmes, Hob.
12.

(b) Fergusson v. Norman, 6

like a tyrant making all void ; the latter, like a nursing father making void only the part where the fault is, but preserving the rest (*a*). But this is not the true test. The question whether the whole instrument, or only the invalid part is void, depends on the more rational ground whether the vitiated part be severable from the rest, or not. If the one cannot be severed from the other part, the whole is void ; but if it be severable, whether the illegality was created by statute or by the common law, the bad part may be rejected, and the good retained (*b*). If a deed was made on a consideration, part of which was illegal, the whole instrument would be void, for every part of it would be affected by the illegal consideration (*c*) ; and a contract of which the consideration is in any part illegal, cannot be enforced. But it would be otherwise if only some of the promises which constituted the consideration, were illegal, and the illegality did not taint the rest. Thus, although a rent-charge on a living was invalidated by a statute, which declared all chargings of benefices with pensions utterly void ; a covenant in the deed which created

(*a*) *Maleverer v. Redshaw*, 1 Leeder, 1 B. & C. 327 ; *Exp. Mod.* 35 ; *Mosdel v. Middleton*, 1 Vent. 237. *Browning*, L. R. 9 Ch. 583.

(*b*) See *per* Willes J. in *Pickering v. Ilfracombe R. Co.*, L. R. 3 C. P. 250 ; *per* Turner L.J. in *Jortin v. S. E. R.*, 6 De G. M. & G. 275 ; *Biddell v.* (c) *Per* Tindal C.J. in *Waite v. Jones*, 1 Bing. N. C. 662, and *Shackell v. Rosier*, 2 Bing. N. C. 646 ; *Collins v. Gwynne*, 9 Bing. 544.

such a charge, to pay it, was held good and was enforced (*α*). Where a bill of sale comprised real as well as personal chattels, it was held void as regards the latter, because not in accordance with the statutory form (*β*). But it was valid as regards the real chattels, because the legal and illegal portions of the deed were severable (*γ*). So, though a bill of sale transferring a ship by way of mortgage was void, in consequence of the omission to recite the certificate of registry, a similar covenant, by the mortgagor, to repay the money advanced, and secured by the same deed, was held valid and binding (*δ*). So, a tenant may be sued on his covenant to pay his rent clear of all taxes, although in another part of the lease he covenants to pay the landlord's property tax; an engagement which was penal and void (*ε*). Where a miner entered into a contract of employment with the owners of a colliery, by which he agreed not to leave his employment without giving fourteen days' notice, and further agreed that deductions that were in contravention of s. 12 of the Coal Mines Regu-

(*α*) *Mouys v. Leake*, 8 T. R. 411.

(*β*) 45 & 46 Vict. c. 43, s. 9; *Cochrane v. Entwistle*, 25 Q. B. D. 116.

(*γ*) *Re Burdett*, 20 Q. B. D. 310; and see *Mumford v. Collier*, 25 Q. B. D. 279; *Re Isaacson*, [1895] 1 Q. B. 333.

(*δ*) *Kerrison v. Cole*, 8 East 231.

(*ε*) See also *Gaskell v. King*, 11 East, 165; *Howe v. Synges*, 15 East, 440; *Readshaw v. Balders*, 4 Taunt. 57; *Greenwood v. Hammersley*, 5 Taunt. 727; *Pallister v. Gravesend*, 9 C. B. 774; *The Buckhurst Peerage*, 2 App. Cas. 1.

lation Act, 1887, might be made from his wages, it was held that the whole contract of employment was not rendered illegal by the latter agreement, but he was liable to pay damages to the colliery owners for leaving without notice (*a*). And a friendly society or corporate body is not disabled from suing by reason of some of its rules being in restraint of trade and so illegal (*b*).

On the same principle, a bye-law which is partly good and partly bad is valid as to the former part, if the latter is distinct and separable from it (*c*); and orders of justices and of other authorities, and the awards of arbitrators are similarly treated (*d*).

SECTION II.—PUBLIC AND PRIVATE REMEDIES.

When a statute creates a new obligation, or makes unlawful that which was lawful before, a corresponding right is thereby impliedly given, either to the public, or to the individual injured by the breach of the enactment; and sometimes to both.

(*a*) 50 & 51 Vict. c. 58; 10 Q. B. 152; *per* Bayley J. in *Kearney v. Whitehaven Colliery Co.*, [1893] 1 Q. B. 700. *Clark v. Denton*, 1 B. & Ad. 95; *Brown v. Holyhead*, 1 H. & C.

(*b*) *Swaine v. Wilson*, 24 Q. B. D. 252.

(*c*) *R. v. Faversham*, 8 T. R. 352, 2 Kyd, Corp. 155; *R. v. Lundie*, 31 L. J. M. C. 157; *per* Quain J. in *Hall v. Nixon*, L. R.

(*d*) *R. v. Stoke Bliss*, 6 Q. B. 158; *R. v. Oxley*, Id. 256; *R. v. Robinson*, 17 Q. B. 466; *R. v. Green*, 2 L. M. & P. 130; *Re Goddard*, 1 L. M. & P. 25.

Where a statute creates an offence and specifies certain persons as those by whom the provisions of the Act shall be enforced, no other person can prosecute for the offence (*a*). Where a penalty is imposed and nothing is said as to who may recover it, and it is not created for the benefit of a party aggrieved, and the offence is not against an individual, the penalty belongs to the Crown, and the Crown alone can maintain a suit for it (*b*).

If a statute prohibits a matter of public grievance (*c*), or commands a matter of public convenience (*d*), all acts and omissions contrary to its injunctions are misdemeanours; and if it omits to provide any procedure or punishment for such act or default, the common law method of redress is impliedly given; that is, the procedure by indictment, and punishment by fine and imprisonment (*e*). Thus, the 43 Eliz. c. 43, s. 7, in empowering justices to order the father or other relation of a pauper to pay for his maintenance, impliedly provided for the enforcement of the order by indictment (*f*). Churchwardens and overseers were indictable for not making a rate to re-

(*a*) *R. v. Cubitt*, 22 Q. B. D. 623; *Anderson v. Hamlin*, 25 Q. B. D. 219.

(*d*) *R. v. Davis*, Say. 133; *R. v. Price*, 11 A. & E. 727.

(*b*) 29 & 30 Vict. c. 19, s. 5; *Bradlaugh v. Clarke*, 8 App. Cas. 354.

(*e*) 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 4; and see the cases collected in Burn's J. Office II.

(*c*) *R. v. Sainsbury*, 4 T. R. 451.

(*f*) *R. v. Robinson*, 2 Burr. 799; *R. v. Balme*, 2 Cowp. 648; *R. v. Ferrall*, 2 Den. C. C. 51.

imburse constables as directed by the 13 & 14 Car. II. c. 12 (*a*). So, refusal or neglect by the father of a child to furnish the registrar of births, when requested, the particulars required by the 6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 86, is an indictable misdemeanour (*b*). Where it was enacted that all persons coming from a place infected by the plague should obey such orders as the King in council should make; the disobedience of any such order, being a disobedience of the Act, would be indictable, and punishable by fine and imprisonment (*c*).

But the matter must be strictly of public concern. If the statute extends only to particular persons, or to matters of a private nature, as those relating to distresses by lords on their tenants, disobedience would not be indictable (*d*). Where the burden of repairing a private road for the use of the owners and occupiers of tenements in nine parishes, was thrown upon the owners and occupiers in six of those parishes; the latter were held not indictable for the non-repair of the road, because the duty did not concern the public, but only the individuals who had a right to use the private road (*e*).

(*a*) *R. v. Barlow*, 2 Salk. 609. Walker, L. R. 10 Q. B. 355.

(*b*) *R. v. Price*, 11 A. & E. 727. (*d*) 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 4.
(*e*) *R. v. Richards*, 8 T. R.

(*c*) 26 Geo. II. c. 6; *R. v.* 634. See also *R. v. Storr*, 3 Harris, 4 T. R. 202; *R. v. Burr*, 1698, and *R. v. Atkins*, Haigh, 3 T. R. 637; *R. v. Id.* 1706.

If the statute which creates the obligation, whether private or public, provides in the same section or passage a specific means or procedure for enforcing it, no other course than that thus provided can be resorted to for that purpose (*a*). Thus, where the land tax redemption Act directed that the tax should be added to the rent in all future bishops' leases, and should be recoverable in the same way as the rent, it was held not recoverable by any other means (*b*). A breach of the 5 & 6 Ed. VI. c. 25, which enacted that no person should keep an ale-house, but such who should be admitted thereunto and allowed in open sessions, or by two justices, under the penalty of summary commitment by justices for three days, was not subject to prosecution by indictment (*c*). The 21 Hen. VIII. c. 13, having enacted that no spiritual person should take lands to farm, on pain of forfeiting £10,

- (*a*) See *per* Lord Tenterden D. 501; *Hayward v. East London* in *Doe v. Bridges*, 1 B. & Ad. Waterworks, 28 Ch. D. 148; 847; *per* Lord Denman in *R. v. Atty.-Gen. v. Basingstoke*, 45 Buchanan, 8 Q. B. 883; *per* L. J. Ch. 726.
 Lord Esher M.R. in *Atty.-Gen. v. Bradlaugh*, 14 Q. B. D. 667; *Lamplough v. Norton*, 22 Q. B. D. 457; *Wake v. Mayor of Sheffield*, 12 Q. B. D. 145; *R. v. County Court Judge of Essex*, 18 Q. B. D. 707. This does not apply to the equitable remedy by injunction. See *ex. gr. Cooper v. Whittingham*, 15 Ch.
- (*b*) *Doe v. Bridges*, 1 B. & Ad. 859. *Comp. Scotch Widows' Fund v. Craig*, 51 L. J. Ch. 363; and see *Cumming v. Bedborough*, 15 M. & W. 438; *Rhydney R. Co. v. Rhydney Iron Co.*, 25 Q. B. D. 146.
- (*c*) *R. v. Marriot*, 4 Mod. 144; *R. v. Buck*, 2 Stra. 679.

it was held that an offender could not be indicted for a breach of this enactment, but could only be sued for the penalty (*a*). Similarly no indictment will lie against an overseer of a parish for wilfully inserting the names of unqualified persons in the voters' list, or for any other of the offences specified in s. 51 of the Parliamentary Registration Act, 1843, as the section specifies a particular penalty for the offences created, and thereby excludes all others (*b*). Where an Act which, requiring shareholders to pay calls on their shares, provided that in case of default the company might sue them in the courts in Dublin; it was held that an action would not lie in England (*c*).

If the newly-created duty is simply an obligation to pay money for a public purpose, the general rule would seem to be that the payment cannot be enforced in any other manner than that provided by the Act; though the provision be not contained, as in the above cases, in the same section as that in which the duty was created. Thus, the 43 Eliz. c. 2, which authorises, by the 2nd section, the imposition of a poor rate, and empowers the parochial officers, by the 4th, to levy the arrears from those who refuse to pay, by distress, limits the officers to this remedy,

(*a*) 2 Hale, P. C. 171; *R. v. Wright*, 1 Burr. 543; and see *per Cur.* in *Couch v. Steel*, 3 E. & B. 402.

(*b*) 6 & 7 Vict. c. 18; *R. v. Hall*, [1891] 1 Q. B. 747.

(*c*) *Dundalk R. Co. v. Tapster*, 1 Q. B. 667. See also *R. v. County Court Judge of Essex*, 18 Q. B. D. 704; *R. v. Judge of City of London Court*, 14 Q. B. D. 905.

and gives no right of action for a poor rate (*a*). Similarly, where highway rates were made payable under a statute which prescribed a particular procedure for their recovery, it was held that that method only could be pursued, and that no action lay (*b*).

It is, however, a general rule, that where an Act of Parliament creates an obligation to pay money, the money may be recovered by action, unless some other specific provision is contained in the Act (*c*); that is, unless an exclusive remedy be given (*d*); and the question may arise whether the particular remedy given by the Act is cumulative or substitutional for this right of action. Where a harbour Act required the master of a ship to pay certain duties to the trustees of the harbour; and besides empowering the latter to distrain for them, enacted that any master who eluded payment should stand liable to the payment of them, and that they should be levied in the same manner as penalties were directed by the Act to be levied

(*a*) *Stevens v. Evans*, 2 Burr. 1152, *per* Denison J.

(*b*) *Underhill v. Ellicombe*, McClel. & Yo. 450. See also *London B. & S. C. R. Co. v. Watson*, 4 C. P. D. 118; and *sup.*, Chap. V, Sect. I, p. 178.

(*c*) *Per* Parke B. in *Shepherd v. Hills*, 11 Ex. 55. See *ex. gr.* *Steinson v. Heath*, 3 Lev. 400;

Pelham v. Pickersgill, 1 T. R. 660; *Maurice v. Marsden*, 19 L. J. C. P. 152; *Batt v. Price*, 1 Q. B. D. 264; *Booth v. Trail*, 12 Q. B. D. 8.

(*d*) *Per* Martin B. in *Hutchinson v. Gillespie*, 25 L. J. Ex. 109; *R. v. Hull & Selby R. Co.*, 6 Q. B. 70.

(that is, by action or distress), it was held that the latter remedy was cumulative, and that as the Act had made the master liable to pay the dues, an action lay for them (*a*). This decision is said to have been based on the ground that the particular remedy given by the Act did not cover the whole right (*b*). But where a bye-law required a traveller without a ticket to pay the fare from the station whence the train first started to the end of his journey, and, by 8 & 9 Vict. c. 20, s. 145, penalties for forfeitures imposed by the bye-laws were recoverable before justices; it was held that the bye-law did not create a debt recoverable in a Court of civil jurisdiction (*c*).

Where an injunction of a statute is general, and is not contained in a clause specifying only particular remedies for the breach of such injunction, such breach may be subject to the common law procedure and punishment, though there be afterwards a particular remedy given (*d*). Thus, under the 10 & 11 Will. III. c. 17, which declared, in the 1st section, that keeping a lottery was a public nuisance, and, by the 2nd, made the keeper of one liable to a penalty recoverable by penal action, it was held that the

- (*a*) *Shepherd v. Hills*, 11 Ex. 55. (*d*) *Per Lord Denman C.J.*
 (*b*) *Per Williams J.* in *St. Pancras v. Batterbury*, 2 C. B. N. S. 477. in *R. v. Buchanan*, 8 Q. B. 883, citing *R. v. Wright*, 1 Burr. 543. See sup., 256. *R. v. Davis*, Say. 133; *R. v. Gould*, 1 Salk. 381.

offender was also indictable (*a*). The 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73 having enacted, in one section, that no person should act as an attorney who was not duly admitted and enrolled; and in another, that a breach of this prohibition should be deemed a contempt of Court; it was held that the offence was also indictable (*b*). So, where a statute prohibited the erection or maintenance of a building within ten feet of a road, declaring such an erection a common nuisance; and, in another section, authorised two justices to convict the proprietor, and to remove the structure; it was held that an indictment, also, lay for the nuisance (*c*).

The same principle applies when the duty is a private one. Thus, the 11 Geo. II. c. 19, which, after authorising landlords, by s. 1, to seize the goods of their tenants, when fraudulently and clandestinely removed to elude a distress, gives them, by s. 4, a summary remedy before justices, for recovering double the value of the goods removed, against the tenant, or any person who assisted him, was held to give them also, by implication, the right of suing for damages for the fraudulent or clandestine removal (*d*).

(*a*) *R. v. Crawshaw*, 30 L. J. M. C. 58. is not, *Re Eede*, 25 Q. B. D. 228.

(*b*) *R. v. Buchanan*, 8 Q. B. 883. The offender is a criminal, (*c*) *R. v. Gregory*, 5 B. & Ad. 555.

Osborne v. Milman, 18 Q. B. D. 47. But a solicitor struck off the rolls for allowing an unqualified person to use his name (*d*) *Bromley v. Holden*, Moo. & M. 175; *Horsfall v. Davy*, 1 Stark. 169; *Stanley v. Wharton*, 9 Pri. 301, 10 Pri. 138. See

Where churchwardens refused to allow an inspection of their accounts, the Court would not refuse a mandamus to enforce the performance of that duty, if advisable on public grounds, only because a pecuniary penalty, applicable to the use of the poor of the parish, was imposed for the refusal (*a*).

When a statute imposes a ministerial, as distinguished from a judicial duty, for the benefit of particular individuals, any of these, if directly injured by the breach of the duty, has impliedly a right to recover, from the person on whom the duty is cast, satisfaction for the injury done to him contrary to the statute (*b*), unless, of course, a different intention is to be collected from the Act. Thus, an incorporated vestry, which refused to perform the statutory duty of removing dirt and ashes, was held liable in an action by the party aggrieved, for the expenses incurred from the refusal (*c*). So, an unsuccessful candidate at an election is entitled to sue the returning officer for compensation, if the loss of the election was owing to the officer's neglect of the

also *Collinson v. Newcastle R. Co.*, 1 C. & K. 546; *Ross v.* See also *Lichfield v. Simpson*, 8 Q. B. 65.

Rugge-Price, 1 Ex. D. 269; (*b*) 2 Westmr. 13 Ed. I. c. 50; *Brain v. Thomas*, 50 L. J. C. P. 1 Inst. 56a; *Anon.*, 6 Mod. 27; 662; and the cases collected in *per Cur. in Couch v. Steel*, 3 E. & B. 411.

the note to *Ashby v. White*, 1 Sm. L. C. 268, 9th Ed. (*c*) *Holborn Union v. St.*

(*a*) *R. v. Clear*, 4 B. & C. 899. *Leonard's*, 2 Q. B. D. 145.

prescriptions of the Ballot Act (*a*). An action was held maintainable by the party wronged against a deputy postmaster, for not delivering a letter according to his duty under the 9 Anne, c. 10; though he was also liable, under the same Act, to a penalty for detaining letters, recoverable by a common informer (*b*). Under the 8 Anne, c. 19, which gave authors the sole right of printing their works for fourteen years, and provided that if any other person printed them without consent, he should forfeit the printed matter to the proprietor, and a further penny for every sheet, one half to the Queen, and the other half to the informer, the author was entitled to sue also for damages (*c*). If a railway company were prohibited, for the protection of the owner of one ferry, from making a line to another ferry, an action would lie for breach of the prohibition, without special damage (*d*).

The Companies Act, 1867, s. 38, which, after requiring that every prospectus and notice of a joint-stock company, inviting persons to subscribe for shares, shall specify the dates and names of the parties to contracts entered into by the company or

(*a*) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 33; W. Bl. 906.

Pickering *v.* James, L. R. 8 C. P. 489. See also Fotherby *v.* Metrop. R. Co., L. R. 2 C. P. 188.

(*c*) Beckford *v.* Hood, 7 T. R. 620. See Novello *v.* Sudlow, 12 C. B. 177.

(*d*) Chamberlaine *v.* Chester

(*b*) Rowning *v.* Goodchild, 2 R. Co., 1 Ex. 870.

its promoters before the issue of the prospectus or notice, declares that every prospectus which does not comply with this provision shall be deemed fraudulent on the part of those who knowingly issued it, as regards those who take shares on the faith of such prospectus, and in ignorance of the unmentioned contract, was held to give by implication to such shareholders a cause of action against every such issuer of the prospectus (a).

If, indeed, the breach of the new duty is made by the Act subject to a pecuniary penalty, recoverable only by the party aggrieved, the inference would seem to be that this penalty was intended as a compensation for the private injury, as well as a punishment for the public wrong; and there would be no other remedy for either the one or the other (b). Thus, where an Act provided that if one fishing-boat interfered with another under certain circumstances, the party interfering should forfeit a penalty to the party interfered with, recoverable summarily before justices, to whom powers were given of enforcing their decisions by distress and imprisonment; it was held that no action for special damage was maintainable, but that the party injured was limited to the remedy

(a) *Charlton v. Hay*, 31 Law Times, 437. See *Gover's Case*, 1 Ch. D. 182, *per James L.J.* and *Bramwell L.J.* *Steel*, 3 E. & B. 402. See *Partridge v. Naylor*, Cro. Eliz. 480, sup., 275; *R. v. Hicks*, 4 E. & B. 633; *Anderson v.*

(b) *Per Cur. in Couch v. Hamlin*, 25 Q. B. D. 219.

given by the statute (*a*). It has been observed, indeed, respecting this case, that no duty was imposed on the defendant by the Act; that he was only prohibited, under a penalty, from exercising the right of fishing to the extent that he had it at common law; that he was not bound to perform any particular duty created by the Act, but only to forbear to do that which, but for the Act, he might have done (*b*). But it may be doubted whether the suggested distinction is substantial. If an Act prohibited, for the protection of particular persons, a railway company from making a line in a certain direction, the company would seem liable to an action by those persons for damages sustained from a breach of the enactment (*c*). At all events, the only duty created, if any, was one to the party injured; and as the Act, in expressly creating that duty, also provided a special remedy for its breach, none other was to be implied.

The right of action, where it exists, is strictly limited to those who are directly and immediately within the gist of the enactment. The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, for example, in imposing a penalty on those who send animals to market with infectious diseases, may give a right of action to the owner of an animal in the market, which caught the disease from the infected animal of the offender, the object of the Act being to protect those who expose

(*a*) *Stevens v. Jeacocke*, 11 Steel, 3 E. & B. 402.

Q. B. 731.

(*c*) See *Chamberlaine v. Ches-*

(*b*) *Per Cur. in Couch v. ter R. Co.*, 1 Ex. 870.

animals for sale there ; but it would not give a right of action to the purchaser of the diseased animals which had been wrongfully exposed, for the Act did not aim at the protection of buyers in the market (*a*). So, an Act which requires a railway company to fence their line, may give the adjoining landowner an action for a breach of the enactment, if his cattle are injured by getting on the line in consequence ; but a passenger injured by an accident caused by such cattle getting on the line, would not be entitled to an action for the neglect to fence (*b*).

The general principle was formerly considered of wider application ; for it was deemed that whenever a statutory duty was created, any person who could show that he had sustained an injury from the non-performance of it, had a right of action for damages against the person on whom the duty was imposed. Accordingly, where an Act required the owner of a ship to keep on board a sufficient supply of medicines, under a penalty of £20, recoverable at the suit of any person, and divisible between him and the Seamen's Hospital, it was held that the owner was liable also to an action by a seaman, for compensation for the special damage which he had sustained from a neglect to supply the ship with medicines, as required by the Act (*c*). But this pro-

(*a*) *Ward v. Hobbs*, 3 Q. B. D.
150, 4 App. 13.

(*c*) *Couch v. Steel*, 3 E. & B.
402 ; *Holmes v. Clarke*, 30 L. J.

(*b*) *Buxton v. N. E. R. Co.*,
L. R. 3 Q. B. 549. Ex. 135.

position cannot be now regarded as law. Whether any such right of action arises by implication must depend on the purview of the Act (a).

Where it was enacted that a waterworks company should (1) fix and maintain fire-plugs; (2) furnish water for baths, wash-houses, and sewers; (3) keep the pipes always charged at a certain pressure, allowing all persons to use the water for extinguishing fires, without compensation; and (4) supply the owners and occupiers of houses with water for domestic purposes; subject to a penalty of £10 for any breach of any of those duties, recoverable by the common informer, and to a further penalty of forty shillings a day for breaches of the second and fourth duties, recoverable by any ratepayer; it was held that the owner of a house burnt down through the company's neglect to keep their pipes duly charged, had no right of action under the statute against the company. It was improbable that Parliament would impose, or the company would have consented to undertake, not only the duty of supplying gratuitously water for extinguishing fires, but the liability of compensating every householder injured, as well as of paying the penalties attached to the neglect of their duty. Besides, the circumstance that penalties for breach of the second and fourth duties were recoverable by the ratepayers,

(a) See *Atkinson v. Newcastle Waterworks Co.*, 2 Ex. D. 441, *per* Lord Cairns, Cockburn C.J. and Brett L.J.

raised the inference that the other obligations were intended for the public benefit only (*a*). So where a duty was for the first time imposed by statute on the master of a ship, subject to a penalty of £10, to give a seaman a certificate of discharge, it was held that an action for damages for breach of this duty was not maintainable (*b*).

At all events, where the public duty imposed by the Act is not intended for the benefit of any particular class of persons, but for that of the public generally, no right of action accrues by implication to any person who suffers no more injury from its breach than the rest of the public. A public injury is indictable; but it is not actionable, unless the sufferer from its breach has sustained some direct and substantial private and particular damage beyond that suffered in common with the rest of the public (*c*). If A. digs a trench across the highway, he is indictable only; but if B. falls into it, A. is liable to an action by B. for the particular injury sustained (*d*). The obstruction of a navigable river becomes a private injury as well as a public nuisance,

(*a*) *Atkinson v. Newcastle Waterworks Co.*, ubi sup. 15; *R. v. Russell*, 6 East, 427; *R. v. Bristol Dock Co.*, 12 East,

(*b*) 17 & 18 Vict. c. 104, s. 172; *Vallance v. Falle*, 13 Q. B. D. 109. See also *G. W. Steamship Co. v. Edgehill*, 11 Q. B. D. 225. 428; *per Cur.* in *Chamberlaine v. Chester, etc. R. Co.*, 1 Ex. 870; *Glossop v. Heston Loc. Bd.*, 12 Ch. D. 102.

(*d*) See notes to *Ashby v. White*, 1 Sm. L. C.

(*c*) *Iveson v. Moore*, 1 Salk.

if access is thereby prevented to the inn of the plaintiff, who loses customers in consequence (a); or if a carrier is thereby put to the trouble and expense of conveying his goods by a road overland (b). When the public duty of repairing a sea-wall was imposed on a municipal corporation, it was held that an individual whose house was damaged by the sea, in consequence of the neglect of this duty to keep the wall in repair, was entitled to sue the corporation for compensation (c). But the injury must be the proximate, necessary, or natural result of the infringement of the duty; the infringement being the *causa causans*, and not merely a *causa sine quâ non*, of the special damage (d).

Nor does any right of action arise where the duty has been imposed by the Legislature for a purpose altogether foreign to individual interests. Thus, although shipowners are required, under the Con-

(a) *Rose v. Groves*, 5 M. & G. 613; *Wilkes v. Hungerford Market Co.*, 2 Bing. N. C. 281; *Lyon v. Fishmongers' Co.*, 1 App. Cas. 662; *Marshall v. Ulleswater Co.*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 166, *per Blackburn J.*

(b) *Rose v. Miles*, 4 M. & S. 101; *Dobson v. Blackmore*, 9 Q. B. 991; *Parsons v. Bethnal Green*, L. R. 3 C. P. 56.

(c) *Lyme Regis v. Henley*, 1

Bing. N. C. 222. See *Nitrophosphate Co. v. St. Katherine Dock Co.*, 9 Ch. D. 503. See also *per* Brett L.J. in *Glossop v. Heston Local Bd.*, 12 Ch. D. at p. 121.

(d) *Benjamin v. Storr*, L. R. 9 C. P. 400; *Colchester v. Brooke*, 7 Q. B. 339; *Walker v. Goe*, 3 H. & N. 395, 4 Id. 350; *Romney Marsh v. Trinity House*, L. R. 5 Ex. 204, 7 Id. 247.

tagious Diseases (Animals) Act of 1869, to provide pens and footholds for cattle on board, no action lies against them under the Act by the owners of cattle which are washed overboard, owing solely to the neglect to provide those appliances; for the Legislature, in providing or authorising such regulations, did not contemplate the protection of proprietary rights, but had in view solely the sanitary purpose of preventing the communication of infectious disease to cattle on sea transit (*a*).

So, although the parish surveyor of highways is subject to penalties under the Highway Act for any neglect of his duties regarding the maintenance of the parish roads, he does not thereby become liable to an action at the suit of a private person who has suffered special damage from their non-repair, or from an obstruction to which the surveyor was, personally, no party. The duties thus imposed on him are duties to his parish, not to the public; the Act having been passed, not to create a new liability either in the parish or in other persons, but to provide for the fulfilment of the surveyor's duty to the parish (*b*). The duty of keeping the roads in re-

(*a*) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 70; *Gorris v. Scott*, L. R. 9 Ex. 125.

(*b*) *Young v. Davis*, 7 H. & N. 760, 2 H. & C. 177; *McKinnon v. Penson*, 9 Ex. 609; *Foreman v. Canterbury*,

L. R. 6 Q. B. 214; *Taylor v. Greenhalgh*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 487; *Gibson v. Preston*, L. R. 5 Q. B. 218; *White v. Hindley Loc. Bd.*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 219; *R. v. Mayor of Poole*, 19 Q. B. D. 602.

pair, as regards the public, lay on the parish; and though a parish, like a county, could not be sued civilly, as it was not a corporate body, and could not be compelled to appear in Court (*a*), this furnished no logical ground for making, under the above circumstances, their officer liable to an action (*b*) for non-feasance merely, and not misfeasance (*c*). The liability of the local board was not more extensive (*d*).

Where a person imported cards contrary to the statute 3 Edw. IV. c. 4, which provided that the cards so imported should be forfeited; it was held that he was not liable to an action at the suit of one to whom the King had granted a license to import cards, paying rent to the King, and who alleged that he was thereby disabled from paying his rent; for the prohibition did not seem to have been intended for the benefit of the person to whom the license was granted. But besides, the damage may have been considered too remote (*e*).

(*a*) *Russell v. Men of Devon*, 2 T. R. 667. *Comp. Hartnall v. Ryde Commissioners*, 4 B. & S. 361.

(*b*) *Per Cur.* 2 H. & C. 198. *Comp. Blackmore v. Mile End Vestry*, 9 Q. B. D. 451.

(*c*) *Pendlebury v. Greenhalgh*, 1 Q. B. D. 36.

(*d*) *Cowley v. Newmarket Local Bd.*, [1892] A. C. 345; *Municipality of Pictou v. Gel-*

dert, [1893] A. C. 524; *Moore v. Lambeth W. W. Co.*, 17 Q. B. D. 462; *Thompson v. Mayor of Brighton*, [1894] 1 Q. B. 332; *Steel v. Dartford Local Bd.*, 60 L. J. Q. B. 256; *Saunders v. Holborn Bd. of Works*, [1895] 1 Q. B. 64.

(*e*) *Roll Ab. Action sur case*, M. 16, p. 106, cited in the judgment in *Couch v. Steel*, 3 E. & B. 402.

SECTION III.—REPEAL—REVIVAL—COMMENCEMENT.

Where an Act is repealed, and the repealing enactment is repealed by another, which manifests no intention that the first shall continue repealed, the common law rule was that the repeal of the second Act revived the first; and revived it, too, *ab initio*, and not merely from the passing of the reviving Act (*a*). But this rule does not apply to repealing Acts passed since 1850. Where an Act repealing, in whole or in part, a former Act, is itself repealed, the last repeal does not now revive the Act or provisions before repealed, unless words be added reviving them (*b*). It is doubtful whether this rule applies to a repeal by implication; but it seems not to apply where the first Act was only modified by the second, by the addition of conditions, and the enactment which imposed these was, itself, afterwards repealed (*c*). In such a case, the original enactment would revive.

Where an Act expired or was repealed, it was formerly considered, in the absence of provision to the contrary, as if it had never existed, except as to matters and transactions past and closed (*d*). Where,

(*a*) 2 Inst. 686; 4 Inst. 325;
Case of Bishops, 12 Rep. 7;
Phillips *v.* Hopwood, 10 B. &
C. 39; Tattle *v.* Grimwood, 3
Bing. 496, *per* Best C.J.; Fuller
v. Redman, 26 Beav. 600.

(*b*) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 11.

(*c*) Mount *v.* Taylor, L. R. 3
C. P. 645. See also Levi *v.*
Sanderson, and Mirfin *v.* Att-
wood, L. R. 4 Q. B. 330.

(*d*) *Per* Lord Tenterden in
Surtees *v.* Ellison, 9 B. & C.

752; Churchill *v.* Crease, 5

therefore, a penal law was broken, the offender could not be punished under it, if it expired before he was convicted, although the prosecution was begun while the Act was still in force (*a*). An offence committed against it, while it was still in force, could not be tried after it ceased to be in force. Thus, the 10 & 11 Will. III. c. 23, which made larceny above five shillings a capital offence, having been repealed on the 20th of July, 1820, by the 1 Geo. IV. c. 117, an offence against it, committed on the 11th of July, could not be punished in the following September; not under the new Act, for it was not in force when the theft was committed, nor under the old one, for it was not in force at the time of the trial (*b*). In an action for less than forty shillings, the defendant pleaded that the debt ought to have been sued for in a local Court of Requests. But the Act establishing that Court having been repealed after the plea but before the trial, the plea failed (*c*).

Bing. 177; see also *Kay v. Goodwin*, 6 Bing. 576, *per* Tindal C.J.; *Morgan v. Thorne*, 7 M. & W. 400; *Steavenson v. Oliver*, 8 M. & W. 234; *Simpson v. Ready*, 11 M. & W. 346, *per* Parke B. *Comp. R. v. West Riding*, 1 Q. B. D. 220.

(*a*) 1 Hale, P. C. 291, 309; *Miller's Case*, 1 W. Bl. 451; *R. v. London (J. J.)*, 3 Burr. 1456;

Charrington v. Meatheringham, 2 M. & W. 228; *R. v. Mawgan*, 8 A. & E. 496; *R. v. Denton*, 18 Q. B. 761; *R. v. Swan*, 4 Cox, 108; *U. S. v. The Helen*, 6 Cranch, 203.

(*b*) *R. v. McKenzie, Russ. & R.* 429.

(*c*) *Warne v. Beresford*, 2 M. & W. 848.

Where an Act which authorised the laying of rails on a road was repealed, it was doubted whether the rails could remain lawfully (*a*).

Where a plaintiff got a verdict for one shilling, in June, 1840, and the judge did not grant a certificate to deprive him of costs under the 43 Eliz. c. 6, until the following month, by which time that Act was repealed by the 3 & 4 Vict. c. 24; it was held that the power of certifying could not be exercised, in such a case, after the repeal, and that the certificate was void (*b*). So, where an action was brought and judgment recovered in 1867, in a case where title was in question, and the plaintiff would then have had his costs, either by the presiding judge's certificate, under the 13 & 14 Vict. c. 61, or by a judge's order, to which he would have been entitled *ex debito justitiæ* under the 15 & 16 Vict. c. 54, but he obtained neither until after the 1st of January, 1868, when both of those Acts stood repealed by the 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142: it was held that the powers under those Acts had ceased to exist, and could not be exercised in the plaintiff's favour (*c*).

Under earlier friendly societies Acts, claims against

- | | |
|--|--|
| (<i>a</i>) <i>R. v. Morris</i> , 1 B. & Ad. 441. | <i>R. Co.</i> , L. R. 3 Ex. 141, where <i>Morgan v. Thorne</i> was not cited. |
| (<i>b</i>) <i>Morgan v. Thorne</i> , 7 M. & W. 400. | See also <i>Wood v. Riley</i> , L. R. 3 C. P. 26; <i>Doe v. Holt</i> , 21 |
| (<i>c</i>) <i>Butcher v. Henderson</i> , L. R. 3 Q. B. 335, dissenting from <i>Restall v. London & S. W.</i> | L. J. Ex. 335. <i>Comp. Doe v. Roe</i> , 22 Id. 17; <i>Hobson v. Neale</i> , 22 Id. 175. |

a society could be enforced only by suing its officers. The 25 & 26 Vict. c. 87, repealing those Acts, provided for the incorporation of the societies, and provided also that all legal proceedings then pending against an officer on account of a society might be prosecuted by or against the society in its registered name, without abatement. But the Act made no provision respecting the recovery of claims which were then pending, but which had not been sued for. It was held that neither the officers (*a*), nor the society itself, in its new corporate capacity (*b*), could be sued in respect of such claims; but that the individual members of the society were liable to be sued for them (*c*).

Now under the provisions of s. 38 of the Interpretation Act, 1889, any repeal by that Act or any subsequent Act, unless the contrary intention appears, does not

- (a.) revive anything not in force, or existing at the time at which the repeal takes effect; or
- (b.) affect the previous operation of any enactment so repealed or anything duly done or suffered under any enactment so repealed; or
- (c.) affect any right, privilege, obligation, or liability acquired, accrued, or incurred under any enactment so repealed; or

- (a) *Toutill v. Douglas*, 33 Soc., 3 H. & C. 853.
L. J. Q. B. 66.
- (c) *Dean v. Mallard*, 15 C. B.
- (b) *Linton v. Blakeney Co-op.* N. S. 19.

(d.) affect any penalty, forfeiture, or punishment incurred in respect of any offence committed against any enactment so repealed ; or

(e.) affect any investigation, legal proceedings, or remedy in respect of any such right, privilege, obligation, liability, penalty, forfeiture, or punishment as aforesaid ;

and any such investigation, legal proceeding, or remedy may be instituted, continued, or enforced, and any such penalty, forfeiture, or punishment may be imposed, as if the repealing Act had not been passed (*a*).

If a contract was illegal when it was entered into, and the statute which made it so is afterwards repealed, the repeal will not give validity to the contract, unless it appears that the repealing enactment was intended to have a retrospective operation, and thus to vary the relation of the parties to each other (*b*).

An enactment that offenders should be prosecuted and punished for past offences, as if the Act against which they had offended had not been repealed, was held to create no fresh power to punish, but only to preserve that which before existed ; and not to authorise punishment after the Act which created the offence had ceased to exist (*c*).

(*a*) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. & E. 943. Comp. Hodgkinson 38 (2). See Gwynne *v.* Drewitt, *v.* Wyatt, 4 Q. B. 749. [1894] 2 Ch. 616.

(*c*) The Irresistible, 7 Wheat.

(*b*) Jaques *v.* Withy, 1 H. 551. Comp. R. *v.* Smith, 1 L. Bl. 65 ; Hitchcock *v.* Way, 6 A. & C. 131.

The 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 11, declares that when any Act passed after 1850 repeals another in whole or part, and substitutes some provision or provisions in lieu of the provision or provisions repealed, the latter remain in force until the substituted provision or provisions come into operation by force of the last-made Act. This provision is only declaratory of the common law rule (*a*). When the Interpretation Act, 1889, or any Act passed after its commencement repeals and re-enacts, with or without modification, any provisions of a former Act, references in any other Act to the provisions so repealed, are, unless the contrary intention appears, to be construed as references to the provisions so re-enacted (*b*).

If a temporary Act be continued by a subsequent one, or an expired Act be revived by a later one, all infringements of the provisions contained in it are breaches of it rather than of the renewing or reviving statute (*c*).

Where the provisions of one statute are incorporated, by reference, in another, and the earlier statute is afterwards repealed, the provisions so incorporated obviously continue in force, so far as they form part of the second enactment (*d*). Thus, when the 32 &

(*a*) *Per* Cur. in *Butcher* 1066; *Shipman v. Henbest*, 4 *v. Henderson*, L. R. 3 Q. B. T. R. 109; *Dingley v. Moor*, 335. Cro. Eliz. 750.

(*b*) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 38 (1). (*d*) *R. v. Stock*, 8 A. & E. 405; *R. v. Merionethshire*, 6

(*c*) *R. v. Morgan*, 2 Stra. Q. B. 343.

33 Vict. c. 27, enacted that certain provisions as to appeals to Quarter Sessions comprised in the 9 Geo. IV. c. 61, should have effect respecting the grant of certificates under the new Act, and the 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94, repealed the Act of Geo. IV., it was held that those provisions remained in full force, so far as they formed part of the 32 & 33 Vict. (a).

The 9 Geo. IV. c. 40, s. 54, empowered two justices of the county where a prisoner was detained in custody, who had been acquitted of felony on the ground of insanity, to determine his settlement, and to order his parish to pay such a sum as a Secretary of State should direct, for his maintenance; and the Act contained also provisions with reference to appeals from such orders. The 3 & 4 Vict. c. 54, s. 7, after reciting the above section, repealed so much of it as related to the Secretary of State, and enacted that the justices should order the payment of such sum as they should, themselves, direct. Five years later, the Act of Geo. IV. was totally repealed. It was held that the justices had authority to make the order under the Act of 3 & 4 Vict. (b), and that perhaps even the right of appeal had been impliedly preserved (c).

A law is not repealed by becoming obsolete (d).

(a) *R. v. Smith*, L. R. 8 Q. B. 146. *Comp. Bird v. Adcock*, 47 L. J. M. C. 123.

(b) *R. v. Stepney*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 383.

(c) *Per Blackburn J. Id. See R. v. Lewes Prison*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 579.

(d) *White v. Boot*, 2 T. R. 274; *per Hullock J. in Tyson*

Thus, trial by battle, with its oaths denying resort to enchantment, sorcery, or witchcraft, by which the law of God might be depressed and the law of the devil exalted (*a*), though the trial by grand assize, introduced in the time of Henry II., had practically superseded it for centuries, was still in force in 1819 (*b*). The writ of attaint against jurors for a false verdict was not abolished until 1825 (*c*). Until 1789, the sentence on women for treason and husband-murder was burning alive; though in practice ladies of distinction were usually beheaded, while those of inferior rank were strangled before the fire reached them (*d*). Drawing and quartering was still part of the sentence for that offence until 1870. Until 1844, it was an indictable offence to sell corn in the sheaf before it had been thrashed out and measured (*e*); an Irish Act (28 Eliz. c. 2), against witchcraft, was still in force in 1821 (*f*); and, as late as 1836, insolvents in Scotland were bound to wear a coat and cap half yellow and half brown (*g*).

Eavesdroppers, or such as listen under walls or windows or the eaves of a house, to hearken after dis-

- | | |
|--|---|
| <i>v. Thomas, McCl. & Y.</i> 119, <i>per</i> | (<i>b</i>) 59 Geo. III. c. 46. Ash- |
| Lord Kenyon in <i>Leigh v. Kent</i> , | <i>ford v. Thornton</i> , 1 B. & Ald. 405. |
| 3 T. R. 362; <i>R. v. Wells</i> , 4 | (<i>c</i>) 6 Geo. IV. c. 50, s. 60. |
| Dowl. 562; <i>The India</i> , 33 L. J. | (<i>d</i>) 3 Inst. 211; <i>Fost. Cr. L.</i> |
| P. M. & A. 193; <i>Hebbert v.</i> | 268. |
| <i>Purchas</i> , L. R. 3 P. C. 650. | (<i>e</i>) 3 Inst. 197; 7 & 8 Vict. c. 24. |
| (<i>a</i>) 2 Hale, P. C. 233; 3 Bl. | (<i>f</i>) 1 & 2 Geo. IV. c. 18. |
| Comm. 337. | (<i>g</i>) 6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 56, s. 18. |

course, and thereupon to frame slanderous and mischievous tales, are still liable to fine (*a*). A common scold seems still subject to be placed in a certain engine of correction called the trebucket or cucking-stool, or ducking-stool, and, when placed therein, to be plunged in the water for her punishment (*b*). To destroy any of the Queen's victualling stores seems to be still a capital offence (*c*). It is still a temporal and indictable offence to deny the being or providence of the Almighty, or, if the offender was educated in, or ever professed the Christian religion, to deny its truth, or the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures (*d*). An Act of 1786 is still in force which imposes the penalty of flogging upon persons who slaughter horses or cattle without a license, or at unlicensed hours (*e*).

But as usage is a good interpreter of laws, so non-usage lays an antiquated Act open to any construction, weakening, or even nullifying its effect (*f*). And penal laws, if they have been sleepers of long, or if they be grown unfit for the present time, should be, by wise judges, confined in the execution (*g*).

(*a*) 2 Hawk. c. 10, s. 58, 4
Bl. Comm. 169; Burn's J.
Eavesdroppers.

(*b*) 1 Hawk. c. 75, s. 14,
4 Bl. Comm. 169; Burn's J.
Nuisance, s. 4.

(*c*) 12 Geo. III. c. 24, s. 1;
see Mr. Gorst's speech in H. of
Com., 8th March, 1882.

(*d*) 9 Will. III. c. 35. See
also Mr. Justice Stephen's Hist.
Crim. L., Vol. 2, pp. 459, 483,
493..

(*e*) 26 Geo. III. c. 71, s. 8.

(*f*) See ex. gr. Leigh v. Kent,
3 T. R. 364..

(*g*) Lord Bacon, Essay on
Judicature.

Down to the reign of Henry VII., the statutes passed in a session were sent to the sheriff of every county with a writ, requiring him to proclaim them throughout his bailiwick, and to see to their observance. Some Acts (the Triennial Act of 1641, for example) contained a section requiring that they should be read yearly at sessions and assizes. But proclamation, or any other form of promulgation, was never necessary to their operation (*a*). Every one is bound to take notice of that which is done in Parliament. As soon as the Parliament has concluded anything, the law intends that every person has notice of it; for the Parliament represents the body of the whole realm, and therefore it never was requisite that any proclamation should be made; the statute took effect before (*b*).

A statute takes effect from the first moment of the day (*c*) on which it is passed, unless another day be expressly named, in which case it comes into operation immediately on the expiration of the previous

(*a*) In France, a law takes effect only from the date of its insertion in the Bulletin des Lois. In ancient Rome, a *Senatus consultum* had no force till deposited in the Temple of Saturn; Livy, 39, 4. See Suet. Aug. 94.

(*b*) *Per* Thorpe C.J. (39 Ed. III.), cited in 4 Inst. 26.

(*c*) In a case decided early in 1882, the Supreme Court of the

United States took notice of the hour when an Act was passed, for the purpose of determining whether it affected the validity of bonds issued by the town of Louisville. The bonds were issued early on the 2nd of July; the Act prohibiting their issue was passed later on the same day; and the bonds were held valid.

day (*a*). By a fiction of law, the whole session was formerly supposed to be held on its first day, and to last only that one day; and every Act, if no other day was expressly fixed for the beginning of its operation, took effect, by relation, from the first day of the session. It followed that if a statute, passed on the last day of the session, made a previously innocent act criminal or even capital (*b*), all who had been doing it during the session, while it was still innocent and inoffensive, were liable to suffer the punishment prescribed by the statute (*c*).

But, to abolish a fiction so flatly absurd and unjust (*d*), the 33 Geo. III. c. 13 enacted that the clerk of Parliament should indorse on every Act, immediately after its title, the date of its passing and receiving the Royal assent (*e*). This indorsement is part of the Act, and is the date of its commencement, when no other time is provided. But where a particular day is named for its commencement, but the Royal assent is not given till a later day, the Act would come into operation only on the later day (*f*).

(*a*) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 486; *Latless v. Holmes*, 4 T. R. 36 (2). 660; and the authorities cited

(*b*) See ex. gr. *R. v. Thurston*, in 1 Plowd. 79a. See *The Brig Ann*, 1 Gallison, 62.

1 Lev. 91; *R. v. Bailey*, R. & R. 1. (*d*) 1 Bl. Comm. 70n.

(*c*) 4 Inst. 25; 1 Bl. Comm. (*e*) *Supra*, p. 59.

70, note by Christian; *Atty.-Gen. v. Panter*, 6 Bro. P. C. (*f*) *Burn v. Carvalho*, 4 Nev. & M. 893. *The Newspaper Libel*

When a Bill to continue an Act which is to expire in the same session does not receive the Royal assent until the Act has expired, the continuing Act takes effect from the date of the expiration ; except that it does not affect any person with any punishment for any breach of the Act between the expiration of the earlier and the passing of the later Act (*a*).

Every statute passed since 1850 is a public Act and judicially noticed, unless a contrary intention appears in the statute (*b*).

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| and Registration Act, 1881, | passed till the 27th of August. |
| which required printers to make | (<i>a</i>) 48 Geo. III. c. 106. |
| certain returns before the 31st | (<i>b</i>) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, |
| of July in that year, was not | s. 9. |

INDEX.

"ABBOTS, PRIORS, AND OTHER PRELATES OF THE CHURCH," 482

ABSOLUTA SENTENTIA EXPOSITORE NON EGET, 4

ABSURDITY,

construction to avoid, 4, 277

ABUSE OF POWERS,

construction to prevent, 171

"ACCESSORY," 380, 493

"ACT OF GOD," 133

"ACTING OR PRACTISING,"

as an apothecary, 377

ACTION,

limitations on statutory right of, 80, 571, 578

not maintainable in respect of breach of unlawful contract, 554

alteration or repeal of a statute pending, 585

for breach of statutory duty, 567

ACTS DONE UNDER A STATUTE,

construction of provisions protecting, 324

ADAPTATION

of the meaning of words to the subject, 84

ADDITION

to, or omission from statutes, when not allowable, 18

clerical omission when supplied in remedial statute, and when refused, 353

"ADDRESS," 80

"ADMINISTERING,"

illegal oaths, 65

a drug, 376, 389

ADULTERATION,

- mens rea, 43, 141, 142, 145
- of seeds, 69
- of beer, 231
- "to the prejudice of the purchaser," 390

ADVANTAGE,

- taking, of one's own wrong, construction to be avoided which permits, 287
- of rule of law made for individual, when may be waived, 544

"ADVOWSON," 229**"AFFIDAVIT," 485****AFFIRMATIVE STATUTE,**

- later statute in affirmative often invalidates an earlier one, 218

AGENT,

- when statutory duty may be performed by, 101

"AGENT, OTHER," 470**"AGGRIEVED PERSON," 265****AGREEMENTS,**

- in violation of statutes, 554

"ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES," 467**"ALL OTHER LABOURERS," 409****"ALL OTHER WATERS," 51, 483****"ALL PERSONS," 118****"ALL PRACTICABLE SPEED," 139-140****"ALMS,"**

- "parochial relief, or other alms," 463

ALTERATION

- of law beyond the immediate scope of the Act presumed against, 113
- of law, retrospective operation of, 298
- of law not made by expression of an erroneous opinion in statute, 434

AMBIGUITY

- of language, 27-29

AMENDMENTS,

- presumed intended to cure defects recently discovered, 35

AMERICA,

revenue laws, how construed in, 406

ANALOGOUS ACTS

to be considered in construing a statute, 52, 432

ANCIENT STATUTES

not repealed because obsolete, 591

operation of non-usage on their effect, 593

"AND" AND "OR," 331

ANOMALY

to be avoided in construction of a statute, 270

"ANY AGENT," 123

"ANY JUSTICE," 113

"ANY OFFICER," 48

"ANY ORDER," 61

"ANY OTHER ARTICLE OR THING," 478

"ANY PART"

of a dramatic work, 272

"ANY PERSON," 46, 236

"ANY PLACE," 476

"ANY PUBLIC PLACE," 454

"ANY QUAY OR WHARF," 400

"ANY RIGHT OF COMMON," 465

"ANY WAY OR OTHER EASEMENT," 465

"ANY WILL,"

restricted by preamble to will of lands, 62

"ARTICLE," 446

"any other article or thing," 478

"AS FAR AS POSSIBLE," 284

"ASSEMBLE," 62

"ASSIGNS," 552

ASSOCIATED WORDS, 459

"AT LEAST,"

so many days, how computed, 487

"AT THE KING'S PLEASURE," 492

"AT THE OFFICE OF," 330

"AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION," 263

"AT THE TRIAL," 487

"BAITING," 377

BANKRUPTCY ACTS

held not to bind the Crown, 190

held not to extend to act of bankruptcy committed abroad, 196, 203

nor to real property abroad or in colonies, 205

omission of words, "with intent to defeat creditors," 457

"BEGIN TO DEMOLISH," 395

BELIEF,

effect of erroneous, 13

BENEFICIAL CONSTRUCTION

should be adopted, 95

never to be strained, 111

distinction between a, and strict construction of penal Acts now much narrowed, 398

BENEFIT,

rule or law for, of individual, when compliance with may be waived, 544

effect of waiver, 546

"BEYOND SEAS," 321

BIGAMY,

mens rea, 137

abroad, 196

BILLS IN PARLIAMENT,

originally petitions to the King, with his answer entered, 55

engrossment of, when discontinued, 59

"BOATS AND VESSELS, OR OTHER CRAFT," 471

"BODY AND GOODS," FORFEITURE OF, 492

"BOHEA TEA," 82

BONA FIDES

necessary in the exercise of a statutory discretion or power, 173, 279, 325
acts done *bonâ fide* in assertion of a right, contrary to statute, 137

"BOND OR OTHER SPECIALTY," 463**BOOTH,**

not within words "house or other tenement," 474

BORROW,

power to, implied prohibition to exceed its limits, 417, 525

"BREAKING,"

burglarious, what is, 387

"BRIDGE," 99**"BRITISH SHIP," 119****"BROKER," 49****"BUILDING," 43, 97, 447, 473, 477****BURDENS, ACTS IMPOSING, 399**

subject not to be taxed, unless in unambiguous language, 402
construction of, to be most beneficial to subject, 402
exemptions from taxation, 405
American revenue laws, 406
costs, 406
forms and solemnities in contracts, 407

"BUSINESS,"

"dwells, or carries on," 465

BYE-LAWS,

made under statutory powers, 417
partly good and partly bad, validity of, 567
imposition of penalty by, 501

"CARBIAGE," 54, 382**"CARRIES ON BUSINESS," 91, 465****"CASE OR CANISTER," 470****"CASH, IN," 99****"CAST AWAY OR DESTROY," 467*****CASUS OMISSUS*, 21****"CATTLE," 483**

CESSANTE RATIONE CESSAT LEX, 63

CHAMBERS,

when a "house," 54

CHANGE

of language, indicates change of intention, 50, 452

CHARGES,

statutes imposing, how construed, 401

retrospective charges not authorised, 284

"CHARITABLE TRUST," 354

"CHATELS," 375, 110

"CHILDREN," 82, 386

"CIRCULARS, ADVERTISEMENTS, OR OTHERWISE, THREATS BY,"
476

CLAIM OF RIGHT. *See* *MENS REA*, 137

"CLEAR DAYS," 487

"CLEAR YEARLY VALUE," 54

CLERICAL ERROR, 351

CLERK OF PARLIAMENT, 595

"COKE," 376

COKE (LORD),

his rules of interpretation of statutes, 29, 385

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION OF STATUTES, 594

"COMMON,"

"right of," 40, 464

COMMUNIS ERROR FACIT JUS, 426

COMPANIES, RAILWAY AND OTHER. *See* *PRIVATE ACTS*.

when created by statute for special purposes, the prescriptions for their
acts and contracts are imperative, 524

implied powers and duties, 502.

where a company "dwells," 91-2

COMPENSATION

under Parliamentary powers, 130

where penalty is compensation, 577

"COMPETENT TO DISPOSE," 75

COMPUTATION OF TIME,

generally, 485
in special cases, 9, 268, 491, 530, 532, 544

CONDITIONS,

statutory duty imposed under, 521, 541

CONDUCT,

estoppel by, from enjoying statutory benefit, 550

CONFERRING RIGHTS,

statutes, how far they affect foreigners, 209

CONJECTURAL CONSTRUCTION, 15, 25

CONSEQUENCES

of a construction, how far to be considered, 4, 26, 112, 496

CONSISTENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTS, 227

CONSOLIDATION ACTS, 35-6, 45, 84

CONSTRUCTION IMPOSED BY STATUTE, 432

CONTEMPORANEA EXPOSITIO EST OPTIMA ET FORTISSIMA IN LEGE,
423

CONTEXT,

must be examined, 26, 40
earlier Acts in *pari materia*, 46
later Acts, 48
Rules and Orders, 49
expired and repealed Acts, 50
Acts on similar subjects, 52
Acts not in *pari materia*, 53, 434

CONTINUING ACT, 596

CONTRACTS

void by statute, when voidable only, 297
connected with illegal Acts, 554
statutes imposing forms and solemnities on, to be strictly construed, 407
prescriptions as to forms and formalities how far imperative, 524, 560
how far invalidity of part affects the rest, 564
made incapable of performance by statute, 552
repeal of statutes making contracts illegal, 580
statutes impairing, 287

CONTRARY TO NATURAL EQUITY OR REASON, STATUTES, 362

CONTRAVENTION OF STATUTE,
how right of action affected by, 554

CONVENIENCE

and justice presumed to be intended by Legislature, 264
statutes commanding matters of public, 568

"CONVEYING,"

"having or conveying," 406

"CORN, GRASS, OR OTHER PRODUCT," 471

CORPORATION,

when included or not under "persons," 85, 118, 460

whether included under "inhabitant," 89

where regarded as "residing" for fiscal purposes, 92

enactment requiring recognizance on appeal, not applicable to, 108

power to examine a debtor does not empower examination of members of
a corporation when a debtor, 17

created by implication, 494

Act which simply creates a, impliedly gives to it its attributes, 496

when created by statute for certain purposes must act with the prescribed
formalities, and for the specified objects, 417, 538

COSTS,

statutes giving, how to be construed, 406

"in discretion of Court," 115, 221

"if thought fit," 175

"may" give costs, 337

"not exceeding" and "less than" £5, 323

effect of repeal of statute giving, pending action, 537

against the Crown, 190, 191-2

of obtaining a Private Act, to whom to be paid, when no one specified, 497

"COUNTERFEIT COIN," 396

"COUNTY," 435

"COURT OF RECORD," 492

"COWS," 459

"CREDITORS," 87, 119, 278

"CRIMINAL CAUSE OR MATTER," 101a.

CRIMINAL STATUTES,

construction of, 135, 368

waiver of, 549

CROWN

- not affected by statutes unless named, 186
- is sufficiently named, when an intention to name is manifest, 191
- Acts for public good, advancement of religion and justice, applicable to, though not named, 192

CUI JURISDICTIO DATA EST, EA QUOQUE CONCESSA ESSE VIDENTUR SINE QUIBUS JURISDICTIO EXPLICARI NON POTUIT, 50.

CULIBET LICET RENUNTIARE JURI PRO SE INTRODUCTO, 544

CUMULATIVE PENALTIES, 273

CUMULATIVE REMEDIES, 572

CUSTOM,

- usage, or local law unaffected by general Acts, 248

CUSTOMS ACTS,

- commodities mentioned in, how construed, 82
- "prohibited goods," 382
- construed strictly, 401
- but not so as to be evaded, 405
- how regarded in America, 406

"DAMAGE, MAKING GOOD ALL," 133

DATE OF ACT, 59, 595

"DAYS,"

- "clear," "not less than," "at least," 487

"DEBT," 69, 78

DECLARATORY ACTS,

- retrospective operation of, 309

DEFECT

- intended to be remedied by statute must be ascertained in interpreting it, 33
- remedied by statute presumed of about the same date, 35

"DELIVERY OR TRANSFER,"

- coupled with "gift," 462

"DEMOLISH," 395-6

"DEPENDING,"

- suit, 79

"DESERTER," 135

"DETAINS," 48

DIRECTORY,
enactments when, 518

"DISCLOSE," 283

DISCRETION,
exercise of statutory, 115, 172, 334

DISPENSATION
with performance of enactments if idle or impossible, 511

DISTANCE,
measurement of, 491

DOMICILE, 200

"DONE," 101

DUTY,
Acts imposing, how construed, 399
implied, 500, 509
power coupled with, 334
distinction between prescriptions affecting the performance of a, and
those relating to a privilege or power, 521

"DWELLING," 91-2

"DWELLS OR CARRIES ON BUSINESS," 465

"DYING WITHOUT ISSUE," 447

EARLIER ACTS
to be looked at, 46

"EASEMENT," 98a.

EJUSDEM GENERIS,
words and expressions, 459

"EMPLOYED," 392

ENABLING
statutes, when compulsory, 334

ENGLISH SUBJECTS ABROAD,
application of statutes to, 195

ENGROSSMENT

of Bills in Parliament, 58

"ENTERTAINMENT," 461

EQUITABLE CONSTRUCTION, 354

EQUITY OF A STATUTE, 355

EQUITY OR REASON,

statutes contrary to, 364

ERRONEOUS BELIEF,

how far to be considered in statutory offences, 138

ERROR

of law, or fact, in a statute, 434

ESTOPPEL

from deriving benefit from an enactment, 550

EVASION,

construction against, 157, 272, 405

what is not, 166

sometimes allowed, 170, 272

"EVERY CONVEYANCE," 119

"EVERY MATTER IN DISPUTE," 124

"EVERY PERSON," 116, 280

"EVIDENCE," 119

EXCEPTION,

or saving clause, 215

EXCESS OF JURISDICTION,

presumption against, 194

EXEMPTIONS,

construction of statutes granting, 405, 411

EXPIRED ACTS

in *pari materia* to be considered in construing statutes, 50

operation of, 585

EXPRESSIO UNIUS EST EXCLUSIO ALTERIUS, 438, 461

EXPRESSUM FACIT CESSARE TACITUM, 509

EXTERNAL CIRCUMSTANCES

to be considered in construing a statute, 29

EXTRA TERRITORIUM JUS DICENTI IMPUNE NON PARETUR, 194

EXTRADITION ACT,

treaty under which made, to be considered, 34

"FAIR PRICE," 98

"FEE, SEISED IN," 81

"FEE SIMPLE," 129

FEMININE WORDS

included in masculine, 495

"FINAL JUDGMENT," 76n., 379

FINE,

imposition of, by implication, 568

"FINE AND RANSOM," 492

"FIT," 130

"FOR SAFE CUSTODY," 375

FOREIGNERS,

application of laws to, 85, 195, 437

how far affected by statutes conferring rights, 209

"FORFEITURE," 492

FORMALITIES,

observance of statutory, 11, 123, 208, 518, 561

FORMS,

and general rules, considered in interpretation of an Act under which they were made, 49

"FORTHWITH," 487

"FOUR, THREE, OR TWO HOUSEHOLDERS," 416

FRACTIONS OF A DAY, 488

"FREQUENTING," 377

"GAME, TAKING," 391

"GAS," 83

GENDER

in statutes passed after 1850, 485

GENERAL ACT, 242

GENERAL ALTERATIONS

of law, presumption against, 113

GENERALIA SPECIALIBUS NON DEROGANT, 242

GENERAL RULES,

and forms, considered in the interpretation of an Act under which they are made, 49

GENERAL WORDS, 28, 84, 113

GENERIC WORDS

following more specific, 463

GENUS,

extension of statute dealing with, to new things, 109

"GIFT, DELIVERY, OR TRANSFER," 462

"GOODS," 53, 86, 97, 110, 462, 473

GRAMMAR, 3, 26

GUILTY MIND. See MENS REA, 136

"GUN, USING," 391

HARDSHIP

must not influence interpretation, 8, 277, 287, 310

"HAVE OR KEEP," 466

HEADINGS OF SECTIONS, 61, 71

"HEARD AND FINALLY DETERMINED," 179

"HEREDITAMENT," 474

HISTORY

of statute to be considered, 30

"HORSE," 371, 458, 459

"HOSPITAL," 77

"HOUSE," 54, 475

"HOUSE, OFFICE, ROOM, OR PLACE," 480

IDIOT. *See* MENS REA, 136

IGNORANCE. *See* MENS REA, 136

"IMMEDIATELY," 487

IMMUNITY,

when statute confers, forms and conditions prescribed are imperative, 524

IMPAIRING OBLIGATIONS,

construction, to be avoided, 287

IMPERATIVE AND DIRECTORY ENACTMENTS, 518

IMPLIED DUTIES

imposed by statute, 500

not excluded because express duties are imposed, 509

express imposition of one duty may impliedly impose another, 509

judicial duties, 511

IMPLIED ENACTMENTS, 493

IMPLIED JURISDICTION, 180, 184-5, 500

IMPLIED POWERS, 500

IMPLIED REMEDIES, 567

IMPLIED REPEAL, 214

in penal Acts, 255

IMPOSING BURDENS,

statutes, how construed, 399

IMPOSSIBILITY,

when dispensing with performance, 541, 543

"IMPRISONMENT," 492

IN BONAM PARTEM,

construction of words, 442

INCIDENTS,

necessary, are included in enactments, 493

INCONSISTENCY. *See* REPUGNANCY, 214

INCONVENIENCE,

presumption against construction producing, 264, 533
modification of language to avoid, 319

INCORPORATION

by Act on one subject of provisions of Act on another, 254
of general Act into a special Act, 254
of an enactment by reference, and subsequent repeal of statute containing it, 590
of a body by implication, 494

"INDICTMENT," 456

INFERIOR COURTS,

statutes giving jurisdiction to, 179

IN FRAUDEM LEGIS FACIT, QUI SALVIS VERBIS LEGIS, SENTENTIAM EJUS CIRCUMVENIT, 157

"INHABITANT," 87, 188

INJUSTICE,

construction involving, to be avoided, 277
modification of language to avoid, 319
but clear enactments must be obeyed though unjust, 5

"INSTANTLY," 487

INSTRUMENTS,

statutes regulating, 407

"INSTRUMENT OF GAMING," 472

INTENTION

of Legislature to be considered, 1, 26, 72, 399
but not of individual framers, 36
See also MENS REA, 136, 148

"INTENTS, TO ALL," 467

INTERNATIONAL LAW,

presumption against violation of, 200

INTERPLEADER ACT

held not to bind the Crown, 191

INTERPOLATION,

statutes sometimes modified by, 319, 351
refusal to make, in penal Acts, 384-5

INTERPRETATION ACT, 1889.

See 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63 in the Table of Statutes.

"ISSUE, WITHOUT," 446

JOINT PENALTY, 273

"JUDGMENT, FINAL," 76n.

"JUDGMENT OR ORDER," 126

JUDICIAL POWERS. *See* JURISDICTION.

must be exercised, 345

implied conditions as to mode of exercising, 279, 511

JUDICIAL DUTIES

implied, 511

JURISDICTION,

presumption against intending excess of legislative, 194

extent of legislative, 194

presumption against ousting and establishing, 178

strict construction of statutes giving, 412

conditions precedent to, cannot be waived, 543

given by implication, 185, 500

taken away by implication, 180

"JUST AND EQUITABLE," 475

JUSTICE. *See* INJUSTICE.

"JUSTICE,"

"any" or "the nearest," 113

"JUSTICES,"

"two or more," 517

**"JUSTICES OF THE PEACE AND OTHERS HAVING POWER TO
TAKE INDICTMENTS,"** 484

"KING'S PLEASURE,"

fine and ransom at the, 492

"KNOWINGLY AND WILFULLY," 135

"KNOWINGLY SUFFERING," 453

KNOWLEDGE, GUILTY. *See* MENS REA, 136

"LAND," 41, 450, 485

LANGUAGE,

- to be understood according to the subject-matter, 74
- ambiguity of, 27
- unambiguous, may be determined by usage, 39
- effect of variation of, 442

"LAST PLACE OF ABODE," 197

LATER ACTS

- in *pari materiâ* may be examined in interpretation of earlier, 48

"LAWFUL, IT SHALL BE," 339, 454

LAWFUL SENSE,

- words to be understood in, 442

LEGES EXTRA TERRITORIUM NON OBLIGANT, 194

LEGES POSTERIORES PRIORES CONTRARIAS ABROGANT, 215

LEX NON COGIT AD IMPOSSIBILIA, 541

LEX PLUS LAUDATUR QUANDO RATIONE PROBATUR, 447

"LIFE OR MEMBER, JUDGMENT OF," 492

"LIGHT AND UNJUST" SCALES, 128

LIMITATIONS, STATUTES OF,

- not binding on the Crown, 193
- apply to foreigners, 213
- application to ambassadors, 200
- may be waived, 545
- strict construction of, 401

LOCAL ACT,

- construction of special clauses inserted for benefit of private persons, 55
- construed strictly when giving privileges, 419
- See* SPECIAL AND GENERAL ACTS, 242—PRIVATE ACTS.

LOCAL LAW,

- or custom, effect of general Act on, 249
- cannot interpret a general enactment, 431

"LOCOMOTIVE," 382

"LODGER," 93a.

LOGICAL CONSEQUENCES,

- implied enactments as to, 493

"LOP," 78

"LORDS," 109

"LUGGAGE,"

"ordinary," and "personal," 453

LUNATIC. *See* MENS REA, 136

"MAGNATES AND NOBLEMEN," 462

"MAIMED SOLDIERS," 119

"MAKING GOOD ALL DAMAGE," 133

MANDATORY ENACTMENTS, 518

"MANORS AND OTHER ROYALTIES," 483

MARGINAL NOTES, 58

"MARRIAGE SETTLEMENT," 99

MARRIED WOMAN

is "a single woman" within the Bastardy Act, 96

"MARRY "

construed in two senses in same section, 446

MASCULINE GENDER

includes feminine, 485

MASTER,

liability for acts of servant, 104, 143

"MAY," 334

MEASURE,

enactments as to sale by, not applicable abroad, 197

MEASURE OF DISTANCE, 491

"MEDICAL ASSISTANCE," 99

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT,

their individual intentions not to be considered in construing statutes, 36

MENS REA, 136

"METALS," 482

- MINES, LEAD,**
not included in "lands and coal-mines," 460
- MINISTERIAL DUTIES, 345, 517, 575**
- MISAPPREHENSION OF LAW OR FACT IN STATUTES, 434**
- MISCHIEF,**
powers granted by Act to be exercised so as to prevent needless, 504
- MISDEMEANOURS,**
what breaches of statutes are, 568, 581
- MODIFICATION OF THE LANGUAGE OF A STATUTE, 319**
supply of omissions, 351, 383
- MONEY,**
not "instrument of gaming," 472
not "goods or effects," 473
- MONOPOLY,**
Acts establishing, strictly construed, 411
Acts protecting, of Bank of England, 161
- "MONTH," 485**
- MOTIVE IN CRIMINAL CASES, 148**
- MULTIPLICITY OF WORDS, 444-5**
- "NAVIGATION, IMPROPER," 95**
- "NEAREST JUSTICE," 113**
- NECESSARY INCIDENTS OF ENACTMENTS, 493**
- NEEDLESS MISCHIEF,**
powers granted by statute must be exercised so as to prevent, 504
- NEGATIVE ACTS, 217, 233**
- NEW JURISDICTION,**
enactments creating, to be construed strictly, 412
presumption against ousting established and creating, 178
- "NEWSPAPER," 404**
- NEW THINGS,**
extension of statutes to, 109, 379

"NEXT APPOINTED," 10

"NEXT SESSIONS," 268, 532

"NO ACTION SHALL BE BROUGHT," 208

NON EST INTERPRETATIO, SED DIVINATIO, QUÆ RECEDIT A LITERA,
362

NON-OBSERVANCE

of regulations, where statute confers a privilege or immunity, 521
of statutory enactments, waiver of, 544

NON-PERFORMANCE OF STATUTORY DUTY,
implied remedies for, 567

NON-USAGE,

effect of, as regards statutes, 593

NOSCITUR A SOCIIS, 459

"NOT LESS THAN"
so many days, 487

*NOVA CONSTITUTIO FUTURI FORMAM IMPONERE DEBET, NON
PRÆTERITIS*, 298

"NOXIOUS DRUG," 376

"NOXIOUS TRADE," 472

"NULL AND VOID," 293-4

"OATH," 485

OBJECT OF ACT

to be considered, 112
presumption against alteration of the law beyond, 113

OBLIGATIONS

often implied from concession of privileges or powers, 507. *See IMPLIED
DUTIES.*
presumption against impairing, 287

OBSERVANCE

of conditions imposed by statute, 544

OBSOLETE STATUTES, 591

"OBSTRUCTION, ANY OTHER," 472

"OCCUPIED," 89, 452

"OCCUPIER," 89, 92, 93n., 98, 480

"OFFENSIVE BUSINESS, TRADE, OR MANUFACTURE," 472

OMISSION

included in "act done," 101

supply of, in statute, 319, 351

refusal to supply, in penal statutes, 384

of meaningless and repugnant words, 329

variation of language in later statute by omission of words in earlier,
21, 456

"ON ACCOUNT OF," 390

"ONCE IN SIX MONTHS," 488

OPTIMA EST LEGUM INTERPRES CONSUETUDO, 423

"OR" AND "AND," 26, 331

"ORDINARY LUGGAGE," 453

"OTHER CATTLE," 483

"OTHER CRAFT," 471

"OTHER METALS," 483

"OTHER PERSON," 469

"OTHER PRELATES," 482

"OTHER PRODUCT," 471

"OTHER WATERS," 483

"OTHERS HAVING ANY SPIRITUAL OR ECCLESIASTICAL
LIVING," 482

"OTHERS HAVING POWER TO TAKE INDICTMENTS," 484

ousting jurisdictions,
presumption against, 178

OVERSIGHT

in statute, 6, 21, 24. See OMISSION.

"OYER AND TERMINER, COURT OF," 484

"PARISH," 491-2

PARI MATERIA. See *CONTEXT.*

"PARK," 411

PARLIAMENT,

- courts cannot question its authority, 208
- everybody bound to take notice of what is done by, 594
- bills in, 55
- rolls, 56, 58
- clerk of, 595

"PAROCHIAL RELIEF OR OTHER ALMS," 463

PARTICULAR EXPRESSIONS,

- meaning of some, 484

PASSING OF ACT, 59, 594

PAST OFFENCES. See *RETROSPECTIVE OPERATION*, 298

PAYMENT OF MONEY,

- enforcement of statutory duty as to, 572

PENAL LAWS,

- strict construction of, 367
- operation of non-usage on, 593
- when a guilty mind essential to breach of, 136
- not applicable where act excusable, 135
- implied repeal in, 255
- repeal of, pending proceedings, 586, 588

PENAL LIABILITY

- for act of servant, 104, 143, 144

PENAL SUIT,

- limitation of time, 426

PENALTY

- on making contract, makes it void, 297, 555
- joint or several, 273
- implied repeal of statute when penalty altered in subsequent one, 253
- See *PENAL LAWS.*

PENDING SUITS,

- effect of alteration of laws on, 308, 588

"PEOPLE, KINGS, PRINCES, AND," 463

PERFORMANCE

of conditions imposed by statutes, when excused or waived, 541
of prescriptions as to public duties, when directory, 528

PERIODICAL PERFORMANCE OF AN ACT,

enactments as to, 488

PERMISSIVE WORDS, 334

"PERSON," 46, 85n., 446, 460, 491

"all persons," 118

"every person," 116, 280

"other person," 469

"PERSONAL LUGGAGE," 453

"PLACE," 480

"place of abode," 90

"place, public," 391

"place of public resort," 461

"PLANT," 471

PLURAL,

in Acts since 1850, includes singular, 485

POLICY OF INSURANCE

is not "a chattel or valuable security," 397

POLICY, PUBLIC,

provisions required to be observed by, cannot be waived, 548

POPULAR MEANING

given to words not having a technical one, 3, 77

POWERS,

construction to prevent abuse of, 171

construction of statutes conferring, 412

implied, 500

PRACTICE. See PROCEDURE.

PREAMBLE, 59

PREROGATIVE, ROYAL,

statutes understood not to affect, 187

PRESUMPTIONS,

- against intention to alter the law beyond the specific object of the enactment, 112
- or to permit evasion, 157, 272
- or to permit abuse of powers conferred, 171
- or to oust old jurisdictions, 178
- or to create new, 183
- or to affect the Crown, 186
- or to exceed jurisdiction of Parliament, 194
- or to violate international law, 200
- or to be inconsistent, 214
- or to override general principles, 115, 121
- against intention that provisions shall be inconvenient, 234
- or unreasonable, 264
- or unjust, 277
- or absurd, 282
- or shall permit the impairing of obligations, 287
- or taking advantage of one's own wrong, 287
- or shall be retrospective, 238
- or shall encroach on rights, 399
- that language is used in the same sense when the same subject is dealt with, 50, 445
- that change of language indicates change of intention, 50, 452
- that legislation is directed against defects discovered about the time of the enactment, 35

PRIVATE ACTS,

- construction of, 55, 419
- not permissible to look at what took place before committee, 39
- repeal of one by another, 254

PRIVATE REMEDIES, 567***PRIVATORUM CONVENTIO JURI PUBLICO NON DEROGAT, 548*****PRIVILEGES,**

- Acts conferring, how construed, 411
- express grant of, by statute, impliedly grants also what is necessary to their enjoyment, 50
- and may impose implied obligations, 507
- and may impliedly give rights to others, 510

PROCEDURE

- in Courts, enactments regulating, are generally imperative, 525
- may bind the Crown, 193
- may be retrospective, 313
- apply to foreigners, 212
- power to make rules of, construed strictly, 412
- waiver of rules of, 516

- PROCLAMATION OF STATUTES, 594
- "PROHIBITED GOODS," 382
- PROHIBITION
 - by statute, effect on contract, 552
- PROMULGATION,
 - no form of, necessary to operation of a statute, 594
- PROPERTY,
 - when granted by statute, what impliedly granted, 502
 - real and personal, abroad, operation of statutes upon, 206
- "PROPERTY RECOVERED," 17
- PROTECTION
 - of acts done "under" statute, 324
- "PROVISIONS," 75
- PROVISO,
 - distinction between, and saving clause or exception, as regards repugnancy, 215
- PUBLIC ACTS, 596
- PUBLIC DUTY,
 - remedies for breach of, 567
 - performance of, 528
- "PUBLIC PLACE," 391
- PUBLIC POLICY,
 - provisions required to be observed by, cannot be waived, 548
- PUBLIC PURPOSES,
 - private statutes giving powers to public bodies for, 421
- PUBLIC REMEDIES, 567
- "PUBLIC RESORT, PLACES OF," 461
- PUNCTUATION OF STATUTE, 58
- PUNISHMENT,
 - how far change of, repeals earlier law, 256
 - See PUBLIC AND PRIVATE REMEDIES, 567.
- "PURCHASER," 79, 390
- "PURSUANCE OF, IN," 324

*QUANDO ALIQUID PROHIBETUR, PROHIBETUR ET OMNE PER QUOD
DEVENITUR AD ILLUD*, 157

"QUAY, ANY," 400

QUEEN'S PRINTER,
record of statutes, printed by, 58

QUI FACIT PER ALIUM FACIT PER SE, 102

RAILWAY. *See* COMPANIES.

"RAILWAY, OBSTRUCTING," 388

"RAILWAY, FOR PASSAGE OF WAGGONS, ENGINES, AND OTHER
CARRIAGES," 506

RANK,
words of, in descending order, 481

RATES,
enactments imposing, are not retrospective, 284
and do not apply to the Crown, 189

REAL ESTATE ABROAD
not subject to bankruptcy laws, 205

REASON,
statutes contrary to, 364

REASONABLE CONSTRUCTION, 264

"REASONABLE TIME, WITHIN A,"
refusal to read these words into an Act, 21

RECITAL,
erroneous, effect of, 440
referred to as evidence of a fact, 440n.

"RECORD, COURT OF," 492

RECORD OF STATUTES, 59

"RECOVER"
expenses, 494
principal, 401

"RECOVERED,"
judgment, 80

"RECTORIES," 229

REGULATIONS,

- power to make, construed strictly, 412
- prescribed by statute, when imperative, 521
- prescribed by statute, connected with contracts, 560
- relating to personal qualification, 561
- effect of, when merely fiscal, and not connected with contract, 563

"REMAINDERMAN," 15**REMEDIAL**

- statutes, but not penal, applicable to new things, 109, 379
- statutes extended beyond their language, 106
- different meaning given to same words when penal or remedial, 443

REMEDIES, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE, 567

- governed by the *lex fori*, 212

REMUNERATION,

- not implied from statutory requirement of service, 497

"RENT," 76**"REPAIRS"**

- of a church held to include lighting, cleaning, stationery, and organist's salary, 406

REPEAL,

- effect of, 585
- by implication, 214
- implied, in penal statutes, 254

REPEALED ACTS

- in pari materia* considered in construing others, 50
- when two passages are irreconcilable, which is to prevail, 215

REPUGNANCY, 214**RESTRICTION**

- of words to the fitness of the matter, 74
- of the operation of an Act to its scope and specific object, 110

RETROSPECTIVE OPERATION, 298

- of enactments imposing rates or burdens not authorised without express words, 284
- illegal contract not made valid by repeal of Act making it so, unless the repealing Act is retrospective, 539

REVENUE ACTS. See CUSTOMS ACTS.**REVIVAL OF STATUTE, 585**

"RIGHT," 98, 464

RIGHTS,

statutes encroaching on, strictly construed, 399

imperative character of regulations annexed to statutory grants of privileges, 521

statutes conferring, how far they affect foreigners, 209

"RIGHTS" AND "INTERESTS," 445n.

"RIVER," 453

ROLLS OF PARLIAMENT, 55, 53

ROYAL ASSENT, 595

"ROYALTIES, MANORS AND OTHER," 483

RUBRICS,

imperative character of, 423

RULES,

powers to make, construed strictly, 412

when enforceable by penalty to be construed strictly, 417

made under a statute to be construed and obeyed as if part of statute, 72, 217n.

"RUNNING AWAY," 50

SALE OF GOODS,

Acts regulating, 554

"SALE, EXPOSED FOR," 377

"SAME CAUSE," 281

"SAME OFFENCE," 120

"SATISFACTORY EVIDENCE," 119

SAVAGES,

jurisdiction over, 201

SAVING CLAUSE, 215

SCHEDULE, 217

SCOPE OF ACT,

presumption against altering the law beyond, 112

"SECOND OFFENCE," 492

- "SECURITY, VALUABLE," 375, 397
- "SEISED IN FEE," 81
- "SELL," 389
- "SENT," 388
- SERVANT,
liability of master for acts of, 104, 143
- SEX, 116, 485
- "SHALL BE LAWFUL," 338
- SHARES,
not included in "goods and merchandise," 462
- "SHEEP," 459
- "SHIP," 100, 386
- "SHOOT, CUT, STAB, OR WOUND," 466
- "SINGLE SITTING," 448
- "SINGLE WOMAN"
may include widow and married woman, 96
- SINGULAR
includes plural in statutes after 1850, 485
- "SLAUGHTER-HOUSE, SHOP, BUILDING, MARKET, OR OTHER
PLACE," 476
- SLAVE TRADE ABOLITION ACT,
application to British subjects abroad, 33, 199
not applicable to foreigners abroad, 203
- "SOLDIERS, SICK AND MAIMED," 332
- SOVEREIGN,
foreign, not affected by criminal law, 200
- SPECIAL AND GENERAL ACTS, 55, 242
- SPECIFIC WORDS,
preceded by general, 468
- "STAB, CUT, OR WOUND," 371

STAMP ACTS,

- construction of, 401
- evasion of, when justified, 272

STATE. See Crown.**STOCK AND SHARES,**

- not "goods and merchandise," 462

"STREAM," 453**"STREET," 129, 435****"STREET, LANE, OR PLACE," 479****"STREET OR ROAD," 454****STRICT CONSTRUCTION, 367-422**

- of penal laws, 367
- of statutes encroaching on rights or imposing burdens, 399
- of statutes regulating instruments, 407
- of statutes establishing monopolies, or conferring privileges or exemptions, 411
- of statutes creating new jurisdiction, or conferring legislative and other powers, 412
- of local and personal statutes for benefit of private persons or bodies, 419

SUBJECT-MATTER,

- words to be understood according to the, 74

SUBJECTS,

- laws of a nation applicable to all its subjects, 194

"SUFFERING,"

- and "knowingly suffering," 453

"SUM ADJUDGED," 265**SUNDAY,**

- when included in computation of time, 490
- snare set on Saturday and left till Monday is "used" on, 389
- bye-law closing canal on, held to be *ultra vires*, 418
- invalidity of service of writ on, cannot be waived, 548
- statutory avoidance of contracts made on, 295, 556
- Christmas Day not included in enactment relating to, 111

SUPERFLUOUS ENACTMENTS, 438**"SUPPRESSION "**

- of nuisance does not include prevention, 378

"SWEAR," 485

"TAKE OR DESTROY," 465

"TAKE OR KILL," 465

TAKING ADVANTAGE OF ONE'S OWN WRONG,
construction against, 287

TAUTOLOGY
not uncommon in statutes, 443

TAX,
Acts imposing, 168, 401
Acts abolishing, 303

"TAXED CART," 432

TECHNICAL WORDS, 2, 77, 83

"TELEGRAPH "
includes telephone, 111

TEMPORARY ACT, 590

"TENANT IN TAIL, EVERY," 248

"TENEMENT," 474

"TENEMENTS AND HEREDITAMENTS," 474

TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION,
statutes *prima facie* limited to limits of, 194

TIME,
computation of, 485
"for making complaint" to Quarter Sessions, 9, 269
directory provisions as to, 530
waiver of provision as to, not allowed if condition precedent to jurisdiction,
544

TITLE OF STATUTE, 55

TOLL,
avoiding turnpike, when no evasion of Act, 167
exemption of Crown from, 188
duty implied from power to exact toll, 503
waiver of power to demand maximum, 545

"TRADER," 61, 455

"TRADESMAN, ARTIFICER, WORKMAN, LABOURER, OR OTHER
PERSON," 468

6

8

8

8

“

“

“

“

8

THE END.

W. B. JONES AND CO., LONDON, PRINTERS, CRIMINAL PALACE, S.W.

"TRANSFER, GIFT, DELIVERY, OR," 462

"TRAVELLER," 93n.

TREATY

to be considered in construing Extradition Act, 34

"TRESPASS," 355-6, 451

"TRIAL BY JURY," 111

TROOPS

of foreign nation not subject to criminal law, 201

*UBI DUE CONTRARIÆ LEGES SUNT, SEMPER ANTIQUÆ OBROGAT
NOVA*, 215

"UNDER," OR "BY VIRTUE OF"

a statute, what acts done, are protected, 324

"UNDER," AND "IN RESPECT OF,"

difference between, 445n.

"UNLAWFUL PURPOSE," 377

"UNLAWFULLY AND AGAINST THE WILL OF," 137

"UNLAWFULLY AND WILFULLY," 127, 135, 138

UNREASONABLENESS,

presumption against, 264

USAGE,

effect of, in construction of statute, 423

effect of non-usage, 593

local, not affected by general statutes, 248

"USE OF WORKHOUSE, FOR," 76

"USING"

a place for betting, 394

"USUALLY SOLD," 383

UT RES MAGIS VALEAT QUAM PEREAT,

words to be construed, 329

"UTTERLY FRUSTRATE, VOID, AND OF NONE EFFECT," 289

"VAGABOND," 75

"VALUABLE SECURITY, ANY CHATTEL OR," 397

"VALUE, CLEAR YEARLY," 54

VARIATION OF LANGUAGE,
effect of, 442

VERBA CARTARUM FORTIUS ACCIPIUNTUR CONTRA PROFERENTEM,
420

"VESSEL USED IN NAVIGATION," 100

VESTED RIGHT,
Acts divesting, must be given effect to, 5, 309
but construed as far as possible to avoid that effect, 298
no one has, in a course of procedure, 314

VOLENTI NON FIT INJURIA, 548

VOID,
rule as to instruments of which part is made void by statute, 564

"VOID," 44, 50, 125-6, 153, 289-297, 455

"VOLUNTARY," 467-8

WAIVER
of observance of statute, 544

"WANDERING ABROAD TO BEG AND GATHER ALMS," 377n.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES,
"light and unjust," 128

"WHARF, ANY," 400

"WHEN," 519

"WHERRY, LIGHTER, OR OTHER CRAFT," 471

WIDE MEANING
given to words, 95
in penal statutes, 385

WIDOW
included in expression "single woman," 96

"WILFUL DEFAULT," 49

"WILFULLY," 127, 135, 138

"WILFULLY TRESPASSING AND REFUSING TO QUIT," 148

"WITH ALL PRACTICABLE SPEED," 139

"WITH THE SAME HORSES AND CARRIAGES," 332

"WITHOUT ISSUE,"

used in two senses in same will, 447

"WITHOUT A KEEPER," 454

WORDS

to be understood according to the subject-matter, 74

when used in popular sense, 77

in technical sense, 2, 77, 83

careless and inaccurate, 354

enabling or mandatory, 334

to be construed in lawful and rightful sense, 442

tautologous, 445

how meaning of particular, to be ascertained, 445

variation of, 445

associated, of same kind, 459

generic, following specific, 463

of rank in descending order, 481

some particular, 485

"WOUND," 371, 467

"WRITING," 491

YEAR,

half a, and a quarter of a, 485

THE END.